

# THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 112. OCTOBER 1911.

SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES.  
By J. H. Stevenson.

CHRONICLING FOR THE FIRST TIME.  
By H. B. Bastry, Ph.D.

THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

10. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

11. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

12. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

13. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

14. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

15. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

16. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

17. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

18. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

19. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

20. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

21. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

22. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

23. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

24. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

25. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

26. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.

27. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.  
By W. M. Parker.



*"The best of our literary magazines,  
by a long way." — The Spectator*

## THE CORNHILL MAGAZINE

has long been one of the finest mediums through which  
the discerning reader may keep in touch with the best  
in modern English literary trends

*The current Autumn Number contains:*

THE LIFE AND STRANGE DEATH OF ELEANOR  
MARX by Felix Barker

MAINLY QUTEIBI by Lord Belhaven

THE ENEMY by Etienne Amyot

DEATH OF A GENERAL by J. Smith-Hughes

THE ALLIES by Brigid Brophy

THREE POEMS by Elizabeth Johnson

"It keeps discovering new purposes to which the  
central tradition of English verse and prose can be  
applied. In an age of exaggeration it maintains a  
refreshing calm."—*The Times*.

"In its pages sensibility, good taste, a feeling for  
tradition and a zest for adventure peacefully co-  
exist. Hearty congratulations upon its achievement."  
—*Sunday Times*.

---

*The ideal gift for ANY occasion*

---

4 issues for 10s. 8d., 8 issues for 21s. 4d.  
(inclusive of postage)

From your Bookseller or from 50 Albemarle Street, London, W.1.

## THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

was established in 1809 and has seen the map of the world changed many times—as a whole and in its component parts. Always through the minds and pens of its contributors it has witnessed and recorded the progress in all departments of social, national, and international life.

A subscription to THE QUARTERLY enables you to keep in touch with this progress ; and a subscription taken out for a friend would prove a welcome and satisfying gift.

---

### ORDER FORM

*(Please detach)*

Date.....

Please send **four** numbers of THE QUARTERLY REVIEW starting with the **current/forthcoming** number.

To.....

.....

.....

I enclose **Cheque/Postal Order** for **35s. 6d.** which covers cost and postage.

From NAME .....

ADDRESS.....

.....

*Please send this form to your Bookseller or to*  
**50 ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.1**

## IMPERIAL CANCER RESEARCH FUND

*Incorporated by Royal Charter, 1939.*

*Patron: HER MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY THE QUEEN*

*President: The Rt. Hon. THE EARL OF HALIFAX, K.G., P.C., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.*

*Chairman of Council: Professor H. R. DEAN, M.D., F.R.C.P.*

*Hon. Treasurer: Mr. DICKSON WRIGHT, F.R.C.S.*

*Director: Dr. JAMES CRAIGIE, O.B.E., F.R.S.*

Dependent upon voluntary gifts, without state aid, the Fund is under the direction of the Royal College of Physicians of London and the Royal College of Surgeons of England and is governed by representatives of many medical and scientific institutions. Money is needed quickly to assist the developments now being made in the conquest of cancer. In addition to the continuous and systematic research in up-to-date laboratories at Mill Hill, London, the work is being extended in new laboratories at Lincoln's Inn Fields. Will you please help?

### LEGACIES, DONATIONS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS

are urgently needed for the maintenance and extension of our work

Subscriptions should be sent to the Honorary Treasurer, Mr. Dickson Wright, F.R.C.S., at Royal College of Surgeons, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C.2.

#### FORM OF BEQUEST

I hereby bequeath the sum of £                      to the Imperial Cancer Research Fund (Treasurer, Mr. Dickson Wright, F.R.C.S.), at Royal College of Surgeons of England, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C.2, for the purpose of Scientific Research, and I direct that the Treasurer's receipt shall be a good discharge for such legacy.

## HEFFER'S



**A CAMBRIDGE  
BOOKSHOP  
THAT IS KNOWN  
IN ALL PARTS  
OF THE WORLD**

●  
**W. HEFFER & SONS LTD**  
Petty Cury, Cambridge

## COUNTERFEIT

**SONIA COLE**

The reasons for forgeries, other than pecuniary ones, are most provocative when one considers the type of people who perpetrated them. This is the first book to treat this fascinating subject in such variety and includes a full account of the "Luebeck church murals scandal."

*Illustrated*                      15s. net

**JOHN MURRAY**

# HOUSEKEEPING IN THE 18th CENTURY

by **ROSAMOND BAYNE-POWELL**

*author of "Travellers in 18th Century England," etc.*

Mrs. Bayne-Powell has studied the 18th century long and thoroughly, as her books prove. Decorations, furniture, pictures, china, linen, the kitchen, food, drink, entertaining, washing, sanitation, heating, lighting, servants, illness, remedies, handicrafts, money, taxation and household superstitions and customs—all, so to speak, bring grist to the author's mill and the result is a graphic and convincing presentment of life in the period. The "good old days" may have been enjoyable for those with plenty of money and good health, for the sick and poor much of life must have been horrible; squalor behind grandeur, dirt underneath cloth of gold—but how gracious and artistic the great houses were.

*With Illustrations*

18s. net

## ELIZABETH BARRETT TO MR. BOYD

*Unpublished Letters of  
Elizabeth Barrett to Hugh Stuart Boyd*

Edited and Introduced by **BARBARA P. MCCARTHY**

Hugh Stuart Boyd first became interested in Elizabeth Barrett after reading her *Essay on Mind*. He lived at Malvern Wells, a village a few miles away from Hope End. Boyd was a scholarly eccentric; his main interest being Greek. Their correspondence began in 1827 when Elizabeth was twenty-one years old, and ended in 1847 one year before Boyd's death. The letters are quite unlike any of her others in that she was corresponding with a man over twenty years older than herself whom she regarded in a way as her tutor and mentor. Later, as she became more acquainted with London life and corresponded with people of wider interests, the tone of the relationship changed; but she never lost the unique intimacy with him and indeed, Boyd was the first person she was with after her marriage.

*Demy 8vo*

*About 35s. net*

—**JOHN MURRAY**—

THE  
QUARTERLY  
REVIEW

No. 606.

PUBLISHED IN  
OCTOBER 1955.

LONDON :  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.  
1955



*Goodwill and  
Good Cheer  
at Christmas*

When considering those to whom you will extend "good cheer," will you send a gift to The Salvation Army for those less fortunate, outside the circle of your family and friends?

Your help will be gratefully received at 113, Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.4.

**The Salvation Army**

---

Printed in Great Britain by WILLIAM CLOWES & SONS, Limited, London and Beccles  
and published by JOHN MURRAY (Publishers) Limited

# CONTENTS

OF

No. 606.—OCTOBER 1955

ART.	PAGE
1. THE SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES. By John A. Stevenson - - - - -	425
2. DEAD RECKONING FOR THE SHIP OF STATE. By R. F. Rattray, Ph.D. - - - - -	439
3. SPAIN. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND. By Arthur F. Loveday, O.B.E. - - - - -	451
4. GLADSTONE AS A 'QUARTERLY REVIEW' CONTRIBUTOR. By W. M. Parker - - - - -	464
5. TWO MINOR VICTORIAN NOVELISTS: LADY GEORGIANA FULLERTON AND MRS NORTON. By Marion Lochhead - - - - -	477
6. A WOODMAN'S BIRDS. By J. D. U. Ward - - - - -	486
7. BYRON AND THE STAGE. By Noel Scott - - - - -	496
8. THE WEB OF LIFE. By L. H. Reid - - - - -	504
9. LAMENNAIS. By Victor Cohen - - - - -	512
10. GERMANY, AUSTRIA AND CENTRAL EUROPE: A HISTORICAL RETROSPECT. By Béla Menczer - - - - -	526
11. THOMAS GRAY. By Arundell Esdaile, C.B.E., Litt. D. - - - - -	540
W. S. TO STRATFORD, CONN. By Lord Gorell - - - - -	547
SOME RECENT BOOKS - - - - -	548

Early Georgian, 1715-1760—The Carlton Club—The Holstein Memoirs—A History of Red Tape—Voices of the Past—Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth—Sir Anthony Eden—My Several Worlds—Mark Rutherford. A Biography of William Hale White—Conflict without Malice—Matthew Arnold—Livingstone in Africa—Elinor Glyn—Israel and Her Neighbours—The Private Diaries of Stendhal—Autobiographies—The Selected Poetical Works of George Meredith—The Great Experiment—Modern Historians and the Study of History—Franco of Spain.


## CONTENTS

### No. 604.—APRIL 1955.

1.	Public Libraries and Culture. . . . .	141
2.	The Rise and Fall of Mussolini. . . . .	150
3.	Prescription for Democracy. . . . .	165
4.	The Development of the English Theatre. . . . .	174
5.	Our Language. . . . .	183
6.	The Continental Policy of President Peron. . . . .	192
7.	Professor Toynbee's 'Magnum Opus'. . . . .	206
8.	Roman Catholic Modernism: A Retrospect. . . . .	218
9.	Industrial Revival in Wales. . . . .	232
10.	The Economics of the Gangster. . . . .	243
11.	The Educational Crisis in America. . . . .	257
	Some Recent Books. . . . .	270

### No. 605.—JULY 1955.

1.	Doubts about the Welfare State. . . . .	281
2.	The Place of the Professional in Modern Diplomacy. . . . .	295
3.	India, North and South. . . . .	309
4.	The British Railways and their Future. . . . .	320
5.	Rights and Obligations of Company Directors. . . . .	332
6.	Turkey after Thirty Years of the Revolution. . . . .	346
7.	The Super-weapon Age. . . . .	352
8.	Race Relations and the Law in the United States . . . . .	363
9.	Dead-end at Vichy. . . . .	377
10.	Sidelight on Indian Federation. . . . .	387
11.	The Jubilee of the Norwegian Monarchy . . . . .	399
	W. S. C.: April 5th, 1955. . . . .	411
	Some Recent Books. . . . .	412

 THE QUARTERLY REVIEW is published in January, April, July, and October.

Price Thirty-five Shillings and Sixpence per Annum, *post free*.

# THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

*No. 606.—OCTOBER 1955*

## Art. 1.—THE SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

Now that President Eisenhower has completed two-thirds of his term in the White House, some appraisal of the fortunes of his administration and some other important developments in the United States seems apposite. At the end of his second year of office he seemed fated to repeat the fate of another great American soldier, General Ulysses S. Grant, who had a most unhappy record as President, as his (Eisenhower's) administration had many black marks against it and was accused of being the servile tool of the 'big business' interests, and only on rare occasions had he asserted himself powerfully to keep it on sane, progressive paths. Some time had to elapse before he educated himself to the vast responsibilities of his office and realised the great power at his command, but to-day he towers above a Cabinet, in which the American people have little confidence, with his personal prestige unimpaired and in possession of an unchallengeable mandate to persevere with his efforts to establish a settled order of peace for the world.

Prosperity is the yardstick by which a multitude of Americans measure the success of their governments and in this respect President Eisenhower has been fortunate. A year ago his administration seemed faced with the prospect that it would have to cope with a serious slump in business, for which it would be blamed. But the setback in 1954 has proved to be only a pause in the onward march of the United States to greater material prosperity, and to-day most of the accepted indices forecast that in 1955 the value of the gross national production will establish a new record.

Like some of his predecessors, such as President Buchanan (1857-61), President Eisenhower assumed his high office with no policies of his own and leading a party,

Vol. 293.—No. 606.

which was so badly split that it could not agree upon a coherent programme. Up to 1952 he seems to have had the professional soldier's usual disdain for politicians and was so lightly anchored to any political moorings that President Truman thought that he would be an excellent Democratic candidate for the Presidency, which he was about to vacate. His one great asset was that the high military commands, which he had held in Europe, had of necessity given him a keen interest and an informed knowledge of the international situation such as few other American leaders possessed, but on the other hand he had never given any serious study to the domestic problems of the United States and, as a result, he was very ill equipped to deal with the formidable array of important issues, about which he had to make decisions as soon as he entered the White House. In the election of 1952 he had run far ahead of his party in the popular vote, but his immense personal prestige and popularity had produced a majority in both Houses of Congress for the Republican Party.

However, if he counted upon the harmonious co-operation of a politically sympathetic Congress, he was soon destined to be disillusioned about it. There is a long record of persistent strife between Presidents of the United States and its Congresses. Naturally it has always been fiercest when the party of the President is in a minority in both Houses of Congress, but within living memory both the Roosevelts, Woodrow Wilson, and Truman, when they were Presidents, often found themselves at war with Congresses, in which their party had a majority in both Houses. Now such conflicts had other causes than the accidents of personality and their emergence had been foreseen before the constitution of the United States was adopted. In one of the essays published in 'the Federalist,' a book which helped materially to shape that constitution, James Madison, a future President wrote: 'It will not be denied that power is of an encroaching nature and that it ought to be effectually restrained from passing the limits assigned to it'; and he went on to advise the framers of the constitution that 'after discriminating therefore in theory the several classes of power, as they may in their nature be, legislative, executive or judicial, the next most difficult task is to provide some practical security for each against the invasion of the others.' But this advice was a

counsel of perfection and, since no written document can provide either a President or Congress with security against the encroachments of each other, intermittent strife between them is inevitable.

Now President Eisenhower has seen enough of war to be a sincere lover of peace and even after more than two years' experience of the vagaries of Congress and its capacity for quarrelling with him, he seems to cling to the belief that war between the White House and Congress, instead of being a normal and quite salutary state of affairs, is disastrous to good government and ought to be avoided at all costs. In his early days in office he gave abundant evidence that he was a rosy innocent about politics and some of his actions and utterances were so maladroit that they horrified his warmest admirers. Accustomed to give orders and have them obeyed, he knew nothing of the art of managing fractious politicians, who could not be ordered, but fortunately for him the late Senator Taft, from whom he had wrested the Republican nomination, behaved in a singularly magnanimous fashion and undertook the management of Congress for his supplanter. Senator Taft enjoyed not only the confidence of most of the Republican politicians at Washington, but also the high respect of his Democratic opponents, and none of his contemporaries in Congress could match his expert knowledge of the processes of government in the United States. So long as Taft was able to guide the Republicans in Congress with a firm rein, President Eisenhower had comparatively little trouble with it and had no need to acquire a technique for coping with outbursts of malcontent, but after Taft died in August 1953 and Senator Knowland of California was chosen Republican leader in the Senate, the President was soon confronted with an awkward situation. Senator Knowland, a newspaper publisher, who entered the Senate in 1935, belongs like Taft to the right wing of the Republican party, but there the resemblance ends, as he is far inferior to Taft both in intellectual power and in his grasp of the realities of domestic and international problems. Upon many of them his views are poles apart from the outlook of Eisenhower; for example, he has always been an ardent champion of Chiang Kai-Shek and a persistent critic of the United Nations' organisation, and he repeatedly took the

egregious Senator McCarthy under his wing and protected him as long as was possible from paying a penalty for his outrageous actions. He soon began to oppose some of the President's policies and to make public pronouncements, which were exceedingly embarrassing to his leader. And in these unfriendly tactics he had the sympathy and active support of the 'Old Guard' of the Republican Party, who find it hard to forgive Eisenhower for depriving their favourite hero, Senator Taft, of the Presidency.

Accordingly, when Eisenhower found that a large group of his nominal supporters in Congress were bent upon frustrating his more liberal policies, he had no alternative but to secure the co-operation of friendly elements in the Democratic Party. Its titular leader is Mr Adlai Stevenson of Chicago by virtue of the fact that he was its candidate for the Presidency in 1952, and he has continued at intervals to make brilliant speeches, which delight his audiences by their wit and elegance of diction and confirm the impression that he is an able, liberal-minded politician, left of centre in his views, who would make an admirable President. But under the American political system he is bereft of real authority at Washington, and there the leadership of the Democratic Party and direction of its strategy has fallen into the hands of a group of Southern conservatives. Among these the leading figures are Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas, Democratic leader in the Senate, Senator Walter George of Georgia, who is chairman of its Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator Harry Byrd of Virginia.

Now such Southern conservatives have never had much enthusiasm for supporting the radical policies favoured by many of the northern and western Democrats, and, when they disliked them strongly, they often acted successfully as allies of the Republicans for defeating measures sponsored by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. They are mostly convinced internationalists, believers in free enterprise, and opponents of collectivism, and, since they had a commonality of outlook with Eisenhower, they found it easy to respond to his overtures for co-operation. Accordingly it was with their aid that he was able to secure the endorsement of Congress for a number of progressive reforms such as the broadening of the programme of social security, which helped the Republican Party to meet the

charge that it was an incurably reactionary party, which was indifferent to the fortunes of the workers and chiefly concerned with increasing the profits of 'big business' and wrecking collectivist enterprises like the Tennessee Valley Authority, which a Democratic administration had started. Force was lent to this charge by the knowledge that all save one or two of Eisenhower's original Cabinet were rated millionaires and its validity was not weakened when Mr Charles Wilson, Secretary for National Defence, who had been President of General Motors before he moved to Washington, made the extraordinary naïve pronouncement that 'What is good for General Motors is good for the United States.' Undoubtedly certain legislative measures of the Eisenhower administration, such as a bill, which in defiance of a verdict of the Supreme Court transferred tide lands, under which lay vast reserves of oil, from the control of the Federal Government to the coastal states, were more amenable to the designs of the great oil companies. Similar criticisms may be made about actions like the decision that Dr Oppenheimer, the eminent scientist, who was the chief architect of the atomic bomb, had forfeited the confidence of the Government by reason of some earlier associations with Communists.

President Eisenhower also disconcerted many of his own admirers by his apparently complacent toleration of the obnoxious activities of Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin for a long time, but, if he acted under the belief that, if McCarthy was given enough rope, he would hang himself, his judgment was sound, because, after a vote of censure by the Senate discredited him completely with the public, this former occupant of the headlines was speedily reduced to the status of a minor politician with his capacity for mischief ended, and his last attempt to make trouble was firmly suppressed by a combination of both parties in the Senate. Moreover, the downfall of McCarthy has been accompanied by a gradual clearance of the miasma of terrorism, with which he had contrived to infect the whole atmosphere of the United States. There has been a steady abatement of the witch-hunting crusades, which were demoralising the civil service and menacing intellectual freedom in universities and schools, and criticisms of unjust features of the Government's plan of tests for loyalty and security are being freely voiced by some of its own supporters,

like ex-Senator Harry P. Cain of Washington, who during his term in Congress was counted a reactionary.

Naturally President Eisenhower was more at home in the international than in the domestic arena of politics, and his knowledge of the former's problems equipped him with authority to impress his views upon both his Cabinet and his party. His choice of a Cabinet was not very wise, as he overweighted it with representatives of 'Big Business' and included too few of the representatives of the left wing of the Republican Party, to which he owed his nomination. One of the latter, however, was Mr John Foster Dulles and his appointment as Secretary of State was probably unavoidable, as he had constituted himself his party's expert upon foreign policy and had been a co-operator with the Truman administration in its bipartisan treatment of it. But Dulles, a very successful corporation lawyer, who is endowed with a serene and unshakeable confidence in his own abilities and is also much inclined to a pompous manner and a fondness for delivering lectures to other nations and his domestic critics upon their errors and follies soon proved that in the rôle of a Foreign Minister he had the same defects as another great lawyer, the late Lord Simon. Time and again his policies and pronouncements were subjected to severe castigation by independent commentators like Mr Walter Lippmann and Miss Dorothy Thompson, and there was widespread agreement with the forthright denunciation of Mr Dulles's foreign policy, which Senator Kefauver of Tennessee delivered in the Senate on March 20 last. Part of it ran as follows :

' Mr President, although the President may not seem to be rocking the boat, the tragic fact is that under his administration American foreign policy has degenerated into rule by fear. The tremendous goodwill towards our nation and our people, which was ours at the end of World War II, has been dissipated into the mists of history. Nobody in the State Department or the Pentagon ever talks any more about goodwill or neighbourliness. Instead they rattle their atomic bombs. These days one hears coming from the State Department not the cooing of the doves of peace, but the sharp click, when someone cocks an atomic bomb.

' It is time we started talking for a change about peace. We should put in a deep dark closet all of Mr Secretary Dulles's bellicosity.'

And there is considerable evidence that President Eisenhower would not wholly disagree with this view of Mr Dulles, as he has repeatedly applied a restraining hand to the latter's bellicosity. He is given credit for ending the war in Korea, for keeping in leash Chiang Kai-Shek and certain fire-eating American admirals and generals, who favoured military intervention in Indo-China, and for giving to the latest overtures of the Russians for an international conference a reasonably cordial response, which was in happy contrast to the douches of cold water offered by Mr Dulles. He has also insisted upon steady support of both the U.N.O. and N.A.T.O. and upon the continuance of financial aid to the European partners in N.A.T.O. and to certain backward countries. And his success in using the power and influence of the United States for ends beneficial to the whole world has on the whole pleased the American people. At any rate there has been no resurgence of isolationism and a recent popular poll revealed that over 75 per cent. of the voters, who were tested, remained supporters of the U.N.O. So the President by his foreign policy, which earned from many voters forgiveness for aspects of his domestic policies distasteful to them, enabled the Republican Party to enter the Congressional election held in November 1954 with a fair balance-sheet of credit and debit items.

By-elections had indicated a decisive swing of popular sentiment in favour of the Democrats, but the sweeping victory, which they confidently expected, was frustrated by the personal intervention of President Eisenhower in the contest, in which the dominant issues were unemployment and the prices of farm products. His personal popularity made many voters reluctant to present him with a hostile Congress and saved many seats for the Republicans, and the tabulation of the popular vote showed that Democratic candidates fared better in states, where the President made no appeal for the election of a Republican majority to Congress. However, the Democrats did achieve their objective, the control of both Houses of Congress, but only by narrow majorities. In the House of Representatives only 27 out of the 435 seats changed hands, and the Democrats with a net gain of 22 seats have a reasonably comfortable majority of 232 to 203. But the battle for control of the Senate was much closer. In the

36 seats, which were at stake, there were 8 changes and the Democrats made a net gain of 2, but they owe their narrow majority in it, 49 to 47, to the decision of Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, who after being elected as a Republican had differed with his party and become an Independent in the last Congress, to enrol himself in the Democratic Party.

Since the Congressional election gave the Democrats control of both Houses, the need of President Eisenhower for the co-operation of the Democratic leaders at Washington has increased, and he has established very cordial relations with some of them. Flattered by his willingness to listen to their views, they are naturally reluctant to take sharp issue with his administration's policies and legislation, and, when criticisms of them cannot be avoided, they are usually pitched in a very mild key. But this attitude of complacent passivity in an opposition, which could dictate its own terms to the White House on many issues, is very unpalatable to the northern wing of the Democrats, who feel that they should carry on aggressive warfare against the Republicans and try to convince the voters that their own party is the only effective instrument for progressive reforms.

One of the severest critics of the working alliance between the President and the Southern Democrats is ex-President Truman, who in a recent speech referred scornfully to 'mealy-mouthed Senators, who kiss Ike on both cheeks' and in a book called 'The Prosecution Rests,' Miss Elizabeth Donahue has charged that the Democratic leaders in the Senate have allowed investigations of certain questionable activities of the administration in power to peter out into futility. And the Washington correspondent of the Louisville 'Courier-Journal,' a Democratic paper, after an examination of the voting record of Congress, has delivered the verdict that 'not only do the Democrats like Ike better than the Republicans do, but they also like what Ike likes better than do most members of his own party.'

But the Democrats are now definitely the majority party in the United States and only a Republican candidate of exceptional prestige and vote-getting power can nowadays be elected President. So even the bitterest critics of Eisenhower among the Republican politicians, when they see Gallup polls revealing that his personal popularity with

the American people is unabated and that in a contest for the Presidency held to-day he would easily defeat Mr Adlai Stevenson or any other Democratic candidate, admit that his leadership in the next election is indispensable. He likes power, but he has no real zest for politics, and no President has so habitually absented himself from Washington to seek distraction from the onerous burdens of his high office. 'First of all Presidents on the golf course and the last to leave it' was the gibe hurled at him by a veteran Democrat, Senator McNeely, and he escapes from Washington to his modest farm near Gettysburg as often as possible. His own personal inclination would be to be content with a single term, and it is an open secret that it is reinforced by the strong desire of Mrs Eisenhower, whose health is imperfect, to be relieved of the arduous duty of acting as hostess at the White House.

The President, however, is under constant pressure from his loyal supporters to announce that he will seek a second term of office, but so far efforts to extract from him some pronouncement about his intentions have only produced cryptic evasions, and his decision may depend upon developments in the international arena. The predominant motive, which impelled him to embark upon a political career and risk the fate of General Grant, was a conviction that the United States must continue to exert for the preservation of security and peace in the world an influence commensurate with its size, wealth, and resources. He foresaw that the election of Senator Taft to the Presidency would almost certainly result in the withdrawal of the United States into the isolationism, which had such calamitous consequences for the whole world in the decades between the two world wars, and he felt that it was his duty to avert this disaster by keeping Taft out of the Presidency and the leadership of the Republican Party. To-day the same feeling that he has a mission, which he cannot shirk, must be affecting his decision. There is available no other Republican leader, who is a liberal internationalist and at the same time commands nationwide respect and confidence, and, if he were to retire, the Republican nomination might well fall to a reactionary politician like Senator Knowland, who could count upon the support of the 'Old Guard' of his party and its well-oiled political machine.

But President Eisenhower would regard the election of Knowland to the Presidency as an unmitigated calamity both for his own country and the whole world, and a conviction that he would be derelict in his duty, if he did not try to prevent it, will probably outweigh his inclination to seek a well-earned leisure. He might be more disposed to stand aside in favour of Mr George Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury, who has proved the most competent member of his Cabinet, but Mr Humphrey is a rich industrialist with no gifts of popular appeal and he would make a very unsatisfactory candidate against Mr Adlai Stevenson. So the odds are that President Eisenhower will seek re-election in 1956, and, unless there is a marked recession from the present high level of prosperity, his re-election would be virtually certain.

There is perhaps more harmony in the Democratic than in the Republican camp, but it is far from complete. Gallup polls show that Mr Adlai Stevenson commands a much larger volume of popular support for its Presidential nomination than any of his rivals, and his inclination to seek it has been stimulated by the generous action of his most formidable competitor, Mr Averell Harriman, the liberal-minded multi-millionaire banker, who is now Governor of New York, in announcing that he will not contest the nomination with Mr Stevenson, but will support him with his powerful influence. Yet the selection of Mr Stevenson is by no means assured. Many of the practical politicians, who run the Democratic machine, think that his speeches are too rarefied in quality to win a majority in an American election, and the southern leaders of his party, who work with Eisenhower, interpret his sharp criticisms of some of the President's policies as an implied condemnation of their attitude. Moreover, in the eyes of many liberals in his own city of Chicago some roses fell from his chaplet, when, during the contest for its Mayoralty last November, he endorsed the candidate of the city's very unsavoury Democratic machine in preference to an independent reformer, who had been nominated by the Republicans. So he may have serious competitors at the Democratic convention, and the claims of Senator Kefauver will have to be reckoned with.

Outside of the political arena two very important developments, each of which may have far-reaching conse-

quences, have occurred in the sphere of industry. The first is the healing of the split in the American labour movement, caused by the secession in 1935 of the more radical group of unions, who belonged to the American Federation of Labour. Under the leadership of Mr John L. Lewis, head of the Mineworkers' Union, they formed a new organisation called the Congress for Industrial Organisation, popularly known as the C.I.O., and in the years since elapsed, while the two bodies occasionally co-operated for limited objectives, they were often at loggerheads and their raids upon each other's unions for members were a constant cause of friction. Some abortive efforts were made at intervals to heal the breach, but it persisted until the deaths of some veteran leaders of both organisations, whose personal animosities had been a large factor in preventing a reunion, gave direction of their policies into the hands of a group of able younger men, who realised how the fissure weakened the power of American labour and were determined to end it.

Foremost among these new leaders was Mr George Meany, who succeeded the late William Green as President of the American Federation of Labour in 1952 and Mr Walter Reuther, the head of the Automobile Workers' Union, who became President of the C.I.O. in the same year. Long conferences between the executive committees of the two organisations resulted in a harmonious agreement about a plan for their merger, and its ratification by their annual conventions in November is confidently expected. Mr Lewis, who withdrew from the C.I.O. his Mineworkers' Union, is very critical of the merger and the powerful railway brotherhoods are not included in it, but the unified organisation, when it begins to function, will have about 16 million members. It is understood that Mr Meany will be its first President and, since both he and Mr Reuther are firm supporters of the Democratic Party, they are certain to exert their great influence to mobilise for its benefit in elections the voting power of the unions under their control, and to oppose the Republican Party, to which most of the leaders of industry and business belong. But neither of them think that the time is ripe for the creation of an American Labour Party on the British model, and when a visiting British Labourite asked Mr Meany, 'when are you Yankees going to wake up and

form a political party?' he got the reply : ' when collective bargaining yields as little for us as it does for you, we may have to form a political party.' The feud now ended hampered the work of organising the large multitude of American workers who belong to no union, and vigorous drives to increase the pace of unionisation are being planned.

But equally important in their implications are the agreements concluded between the Automobile Workers' Union and the two great corporations, the Ford Motor Co. and General Motors, which dominate the motor-manufacturing industry of the United States, for the inauguration of a system of guaranteed annual wages. It is true that under the schemes, which both these corporations have accepted, the benefits are comparatively modest both in their amount and duration and the funds, which they will establish to support them, are protected by a number of restrictions, which will operate in their favour.

But the establishment of the principle of a guaranteed annual wage is undoubtedly a landmark in the history of American industry and it will tend to bring the automobile workers, who have accomplished the pioneering work for it, into the salaried class and to reconcile them to the capitalist system. Naturally, however, there is widespread speculation about the effects of the new system, if it is widely adopted, upon the outlook of the American workers towards politics and industry. For one thing the comparative ease with which the bargains with the Ford Co. and General Motors were achieved, will confirm the validity of the thesis of Mr Meany that collective bargaining is a more effective instrument for promoting the interest of the workers than political activity, and, while the guaranteed annual wage will bring capital and labour into closer partnership, the forecast is being made in some quarters that sooner or later the unions will begin to claim some effective participation in the functions of management.

The relations between the white and coloured citizens of the United States have long been one of the country's most difficult domestic problems and therefore immense interest has been aroused by legal decisions of the Supreme Court, which open the door for a revolutionary change in them in the Southern states, where the problem has been most acute on account of the rigid lines of demarcation by colour drawn in educational and other fields.

In June 1954, the Supreme Court decreed that negro segregation in the public schools of the United States was unconstitutional and a year later, after long consideration of pleas by white and negro lawyers and advisory briefs submitted by the Department of Justice, the Court, in a unanimous verdict about the procedure for this fateful transition, declared that: 'All provisions of federal state or local laws requiring or permitting racial discrimination in public education must yield to the principle that discrimination is unconstitutional.'

The effect of such a pronouncement is to nullify the effect of laws of Southern states, which enforce segregation in their public schools and the claims of school boards that they cannot start desegregation, because state laws forbid it.

The Court also decided that the process of desegregation shall be supervised by Federal district courts on account of their proximity to local conditions and that these courts will be guided by 'equitable principles' and 'the public interest in arranging the transition,' but it added that 'it should go without saying that the vitality of constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them.'

District courts are to insist that school authorities 'make a prompt and reasonable start towards full compliance,' but, once a start is made, they are given the latitude to grant additional time 'if the school authorities can prove that they are hampered by problems of administration, school, plant, transportation, personnel, revision of school districts, local laws and regulations.' But the Court refrained from setting a deadline for the accomplishment of desegregation, contenting itself with saying that it should be carried out with all deliberate speed.

Inevitably this verdict of the Supreme Court produced a furious outcry of protest from Southern politicians and newspapers. Governor Marvin of Georgia said, 'No matter how much the Supreme Court seeks to sugarcoat its bitter pill of tyranny the people of Georgia and the South will not swallow it,' and Congressman Edward Hebert of Louisiana, a Democrat, described the new ruling as 'a weaselworded escape from a basically wrong decision.'

Typical of the violent opposition of most of the Southern newspapers was this editorial comment of the influential 'News-Leader' of Richmond, Virginia:

'Yesterday's opinion of the Supreme Court ended nothing. It changed nothing. And if it be said that the Court's opinion was conciliatory we would reply that the South is no more of a mind to conciliate on Wednesday than it was on Tuesday. When the Court proposes that its social revolution should be imposed upon the South as soon as practicable, there are those who would respond that "as soon as practicable" means never.'

The 'News-Leader', however, pronounced against open defiance of the authority of the Court and proceeded thus :

'To acknowledge the Court's authority does not mean that the South is helpless. . . . Rather it is to enter upon a long course of lawful resistance ; it is to take advantage of every moment of the law's delays. . . . Litigate ? Let us pledge ourselves to litigate this thing for fifty years. If one remedial law is rendered invalid, let us try another ; and if the second is ruled invalid, then let us enact a third.

'But while we resist let us do everything we can—not because of the Supreme Court but in spite of the Supreme Court to raise the cultural and educational levels of all of our people.'

But in other quarters in the South, soberer counsels prevail. Senator George, one of its most influential politicians, said in an interview, 'The Court has said go slow but go : proceed but proceed with care,' and the powerful 'Star-Telegram' of Fort Worth, Texas, refused to denounce the verdict, but said that 'The South has gained nothing but time.'

The great merit of the Court's latest decision is that it insists clearly and unequivocally upon desegregation and leaves time and latitude for each community to reach the goal, which has been prescribed and, while a spate of litigation is in prospect and resistance to the change in many communities will be bitter and prolonged, the ultimate end of segregation is now inevitable.

A large share of the credit for these notable decisions is being given to Chief-Justice Warren, a liberal Republican, who, as Governor of California, had a fine record as a progressive reformer and, since he was appointed to his present office by President Eisenhower, it can be taken for granted that in future elections the Republicans will try to win back the coloured vote, most of which had been allured into the Democratic fold by Franklin Roosevelt, by claiming that this removal of unjust educational barriers had been achieved under a Republican administration.

J. A. STEVENSON.

Art. 2.—DEAD RECKONING FOR THE SHIP OF  
STATE.

APART from the possibility of world war, the greatest problem confronting us is connected with the growth of population in the world. Dr Julian Huxley has estimated that at the dawn of civilisation the population of the Earth was 5 millions; by 5000 B.C., 20m.; in 800 B.C., 100m.; by A.D. 1650, 540m.; in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, over 1,000m.\* By 1900, world population was 1,500m.; by 1938, 2,000m.; to-day it is 2,500m. It is increasing by 1 per cent. per annum—a net increase of 20m. a year or 60,000 every twenty-four hours. In five months the world adds to its population a number equal to the population of Australia; in eight months a number equal to the population of Canada; in  $2\frac{1}{2}$  years a number equal to the population of Britain. In 1984, at the present rate of increase, world population will be 4,000m.

There are 600m. in the Chinese Republic: one person in every four of the world's population is Chinese. The population of India is 390m. Western Europe has 275m. There are 250m. negroes in the world. The population of Russia is 220m. America has 164m. There are 11m. Jews in the world.

The rate of increase varies greatly in different countries. In China, ancestor-worship over many centuries created proclivity for large families. In India, fertility religion did the same, encouraging child marriage and the production of weak children; in the last fifty years the population of India increased by 109m.; in the last 10 years by 50m.; it increases by 400,000 a month. In Russia the rate of increase is between  $4\frac{1}{2}$ m. and 5m. a year; she taxes the unmarried and also married couples with one child; every married couple is expected to have at least three children. In 1954 the total number of Americans increased by 3m. A distinguished American statesman has said that in two hundred years the North American continent will be inhabited entirely by French-speaking negroes, the negroes in the U.S.A. and the Catholic French-Canadians being so prolific.

---

\* 'World Review,' Jan., 1950.

The percentage increase of Russia is 2 ; America,  $1\frac{3}{4}$  ; Germany, 1 ; France,  $\frac{3}{4}$  ; Britain,  $\frac{1}{4}$ .\*

The distribution of population varies enormously. In relation to habitable areas, Australasia has 3.75 persons to the square mile ; Canada, 7.25 ; New Zealand, 16.8 ; Russia, 20 ; North America, 40 ; England, Wales and Scotland, 410—Great Britain and Northern Ireland, 483—England and Wales, 678. Great Britain is considerably smaller in area than Oregon. The land of England and Wales is smaller than that of Georgia, while the population is fourteen times as great. The population of New Zealand is no more than the population of Essex spread over an area twice the size of England. The population of Western Australia equals the population of Bristol spread over an area equal to that of England, Wales, and Scotland. In the U.S.A. there are 12.5 acres for every inhabitant. If the entire human race were in the U.S.A., there would scarcely be more people to the square mile than there are now in England and Wales.

The basic problem of the population of the Earth is, of course, food. If the total amount of food produced in the world is set against the total number of population, it may be said that the former has caught up with the latter. (In North America, food has outstripped population.) But increase of food has taken place chiefly in the best agricultural areas. Many under-developed areas (especially in Asia, but also in Africa and Latin America) are worse off than before the war.

The world's surface includes much ice and snow, much desert and many mountains. If the land in the world were shared equally among its inhabitants, there would be 14 or 15 acres for each, but of these only 4 or 5 are potentially productive and only 1 is actually. No large areas of virgin land are available for easy exploitation.

Not one person in five lives in country areas. Only one in twenty works in agriculture. The large majority of the

---

\* In the nineteenth century the rate of increase was greatest in England and Wales—from 10m. to 33m. This was relieved by emigration. Before 1910 five out of six couples made no attempt to determine the number of children or time of their arrival. Of the generation who married in 1920-24 more than half tried to plan their families. It was not until the marriage group of 1930-34 that the majority of those who tried to plan their families used contraceptive methods.

world's food producers are peasants practising primitive forms of agriculture, susceptible of little improvement.

The world is a poor place ; 80 per cent. of its population has a standard of less than 2*l.* a week. In Asia are 1,000m. who never have enough to eat or wear. Dirt, cold, dust, wet, misery, and oppression of spirit appear to be the practically irremediable condition of two-fifths of the human race. The world, in usual conditions, is an area of poverty with relatively small oases of comparative plenty, and its productive capacity has been, up to the present, even if it were shared equally, insufficient to feed, clothe, house, and educate all inhabitants to an adequate standard.

In 1950 it was estimated that the annual income per head in the U.S.A. was \$1,453 ; Canada, 870 ; New Zealand, 856 ; Switzerland, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Denmark, 775. These eight countries had 10 per cent. of the world's population but 56 per cent. of its income. South Africa had an annual income per head of \$264 ; Rhodesia, 101. Seventeen countries had \$100 or less, including Ceylon, 67 ; India, 57 ; Pakistan, 51. Ten countries had less than \$50 per head, including Burma, 36 ; China, 27 ; and Indonesia, 25. This group comprised half the world's population, but had only 9 per cent. of the world's income.

The popular cure for 'under-development' is industrialisation. But many people do not want it. Even in the Highlands of Scotland people are content with a 'low standard of living' because of other assets they enjoy. In such areas it is entirely misconceived to build factories for the local people. Bernard Shaw said, 'Do not unto others as you would like them to do to you : their tastes may be different.' Africa, according to Mrs Elspeth Huxley, is not young and primitive but old and decadent, a continent that reveals little continuity of development—in which great efforts often produce surprising results. This 'jack-daw' continent, she says, is distorting some of our ideas and rejecting others.

A vast extent of virgin territory has been looted of its capital reserves.

'People thought they would turn prairies into wheatfields, and produced deserts ; proclaimed the conquest of the air, and found they had defeated civilisation ; chopped down vast

forests to provide the newsprint for that universal literacy which was to make the world safe by intelligence, and we got erosion and the popular press,\* including comic strips and horror comics. 'We waste the Earth's resources, ruin its soil, ravage its forests, pour filth into its rivers and poisonous fumes into its air.'† 'Fouling the rivers, killing off the wild animals, washing the topsoil into the sea, burning up an ocean of petroleum, squandering the minerals it has taken the whole of geological time to deposit. An orgy of criminal imbecility. And they call it progress.'‡

'The United States is devouring the world's mineral and fuel resources at an almost terrifying rate. The report of the President's Material Policy Commission, known as the Paley Report, points out: "The quantity of most metals and mineral fuels used in the United States since the first world war exceeds the total used throughout the entire world in all of history preceding 1914. . . . Whereas at the start of the century we produced some 15 per cent more raw materials than we consumed (excluding food), by mid-century we were consuming 10 per cent more materials than we produced."§

#### In Britain

'successive presidents of the Institution of Mining and Metallurgy and other leading men in the mining world have repeatedly drawn attention to the seriousness of the problem of metal supplies that will confront us in the not very distant future. The fact is that the known sources of several metals are being rapidly exhausted and for many years there has been a marked absence of discoveries capable of replacing them.'||

'Whereas ores of copper averaging less than 13 per cent. copper were at one time thought impracticable, by 1900 the average content of ore used in the United States was 5 per cent., and by 1950 it had fallen below 1 per cent. To-day to obtain 900,000 tons of copper it is necessary to process over 100m. tons of ore at immense expenditure of energy.'¶

Then we are consuming the output of capital equipment and labour in manufacturing substitutes. In our efforts to save timber we have been using materials which, as things

---

\* 'To-day's news-story is the beginnings of to-morrow's coal fire, and this week's magazine article is of little further value until it is used to line the shelves at next spring cleaning.'—'The Times Literary Supplement,' Dec. 3, 1954.

† Mr Aldous Huxley, 'The Perennial Philosophy.'

‡ Mr Aldous Huxley, 'Ape and Essence.'

§ 'The Times,' Jan. 7, 1955.

|| 'The Times,' Jan. 13, 1955.

¶ 'The Times,' Jan. 7, 1955.

stand at present, are irreplaceable—steel, aluminium, cement, coal, etc.

Machinery has been largely used to increase not output but leisure.

In spite of this precarious world economy, western civilisation has incurred heavy commitments in 'social security.' In 1951 the benefits per capita were (in dollars) : the Saar, 116 ; New Zealand, 102 ; Luxembourg, 100 ; France, 96 ; Belgium, 89 ; Sweden, 83 ; Canada, 80 ; Germany, 78 ; U.S.A., 75 ; U.K., 70 ; Australia, 51 ; Ireland, 25 ; Italy, 25 ; South Africa, 9 ; Turkey, 3.

Improving conditions in under-developed countries raise the prices of their exports—tea is a recent example. Increased home demands for raw materials in all countries, whether under-developed or highly developed, make it more difficult for importers to get supplies. In this respect Britain is one of the worst-off countries. Europe's share of world trade has been declining steadily both in value and in volume for the past forty years and this has been accompanied by reduction in intra-European trade.

The conditions in our own country make us peculiarly vulnerable. It is estimated officially that during the year ended June 30, 1954, the population of England and Wales increased by 184,000 : the number of persons aged 65 or over rose by 108,000 and the number of children under 14 by 96,000. Since the 1951 census the population has increased by 500,000. Every year England is losing 50,000 acres of agricultural land, mainly by building. Although in output per acre we are second only to Denmark, the Netherlands, and Belgium, we, with our 50m. people, who need 1 acre to feed 1 person at the present level of farming, have only 50m. acres available, apart from about 12m. acres of marginal land. The continued increase in mechanisation in agriculture does not appear to have increased the output per man per year beyond the peak year of 1943-4 : there is a tendency now in this industry as in others to use it for reducing hours of labour.

We have heard a great deal about our increased production. But it is not sufficient for our needs and it is in manufactured articles. There has not been a corresponding increase of home-produced food or coal—the only raw material that this country possesses in even potential abundance. On Feb. 25, 1955, the Chancellor of the

Exchequer said that since October coal production had declined and in the first 16 weeks of winter was  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. down on the year before. During the first 8 weeks of 1955 it was 1m. tons less than in the same period a year ago and 1m. more tons were imported. Steel would have to be imported this year in considerable quantity. Production was rising, but not fast enough to meet our needs. Of the increase in our total production two-thirds have to be used to redress the balance of payments and one-third to provide capital investment and defence.

In the 1951 census the numbers in agriculture had fallen (since 1941) from 1,138,000 to 1,064,000; the numbers in mining from 1,079,000 to 845,000; in textiles from 2,025,000 to 1,770,000. The numbers have been almost doubled in metal manufacture, engineering, vehicle construction and repair—from 2,055,000 to 3,948,000—and in chemicals also almost doubled—from 225,000 to 444,000.

The rise in public expenditure has been colossal: (1) national: in Lloyd George's day the budget was 100m.l.; to-day it is 4,000m.l.; (2) local: rates average twenty shillings in the pound.

Let us look at old-age pensions. The expectation of life for a male in the period 1901-10 was 48·53 years; it is now 67·06: for a female it was 52·38; it is now 72·35. In 1900 to every person of pensionable age there were 10 of working age. In 1950 to every person of pensionable age there were 5 of working age. Within the next twenty-five years, while the working population may increase by 2 per cent., the population of pensionable age will grow by 40 per cent. and the actual number by 80 per cent. (since classes formerly excluded are now included). In 1975 to every person of pensionable age there will be 3 of working age. The number of people of pensionable age is due to rise from the 7m. of 1952 to 10m. in 1977. In 1977 the deficit will be 417m.l. The recent increases in benefits, in spite of increased contributions, will increase this deficit. By 1978 the amount paid to old-age pensioners will rise to 100 times the amount paid to non-contributory old-age pensioners in 1910. The outlay on pensions will rise between 1953 and 1979 by 139 per cent.

The capital value of the National Insurance scheme is 33,000m.l. This is about 25 per cent. more than the National Debt. The capital value of future contributors is

17,000m.l., leaving the Exchequer to meet 16,000m.l. The public social budget will require, as compared with 1952—in 1962, 34 per cent. more ; in 1972, 41 per cent. more ; in 1982, 60 per cent. more. Any improvements in rates of benefit will require still larger increases.

Let us glance at one other example of the height of public expenditure, that in education. During 1955 the taxpayers and ratepayers will contribute 350m.l. and from this year the cost will go up and up. The scale of expenditure can be seen in the fact that a woman medical student gets 424l. annually from her County Council. Poor parents might have four children at Oxford or Cambridge getting 400l. a year each—in three years 4,800l., in a medical course of six years, 9,600l. To maintain the seven children of a rag-gatherer since 1948 has cost the Lancashire County Council 10,000l.

In 1953 the proportion of the population under 15 years of age was 22 per cent. ; of those between 15 and 64 years of age, 66 per cent. ; of those aged 65 and over, 11 per cent. Two-thirds of the population have economically to maintain not only themselves but also one-third of the population. Marriage is more popular than it was twenty or thirty years ago and more people marry earlier ; and, as we have seen, people are living longer : therefore the numbers to be maintained by the working population will go up.

In spite of recent laudable reductions in the numbers of civil servants, to-day in this country there are 6,170,000 persons employed in public service—26½ per cent. of the working population—not including doctors and dentists other than those in the service of hospital boards. When we consider the high proportion of citizens not producing tangible wealth, we can sense the magnitude of the economic burden devolving on those who do.

Cromwell, in reply to the Levellers, pointed out that 'one man one vote' would mean that the poor would govern the rich. In the nineteenth century, Spencer saw that when democracy comes to power, it is obsessed by sanguine expectations of benefits to come from social reorganisation ; that whoever seeks its votes must flatter King Demos ; that M.P.s stand for party needs and regard-for-the-next-election ; that journalists, always chary of saying what is distasteful to their readers, go with the

stream and add to its force ; and that the last thing that people want to hear is disagreeable truths. Lecky prophesied that the proletariat would use politics to further its own interests ; it would be more aggressive than a contented oligarchy with an assured ascendancy, and being, by virtue of its numbers, its growing cohesion, and its key position in the economic order, more powerful than any other class, would break conventional and moral restraint in the exercise of sovereignty : the State would become a mechanism for the expropriation of the well-to-do ; taxes would be confiscatory ; the legislators would be in the position of servants ; legislation would be the result of compromise with the powerful interests in the State.

In 1943 a tidal wave of utopianism was sweeping over our people and it continued to advance. Social benefits were poured on people, irrespective of need. For example, before the family allowances legislation was passed, it was pointed out that fewer than 10 per cent. of our children suffered from malnutrition and of this a considerable proportion was due not to poverty (indeed, a number of these children were overfed) but to incompetent mothers. Nevertheless, family allowances were showered on all families (with more than one child) and free secondary (as well as primary) education was provided. One main social result of the end of the war, continuing since, was the truculence of manual workers. Owing to full employment, they could not be dismissed. Hence widespread *ca' canny*.

Since recent years, neither of the two main political parties is a one-class party. Conservatives attract nearly as many working-class as middle-class voters. Labour's working-class supporters would not have been enough to give it victory in the 1945 election. In that election the middle class gave one vote to Labour for every two it gave to the Conservatives. In 1950 it gave one vote to Labour for every three it gave the Conservatives. The working-class wing was about the same. It was along the boundary-line between middle and working class that Labour suffered most. The result of national elections depends on a few marginal seats and in these constituencies power rests mainly with lower-salaried employees and small proprietors, who desire (1) to maintain the security of property and avoid violent change, (2) to secure for themselves the advantages of State social services. The margin within which

either party can work is very narrow. Hence reforms that on merits are crying to be carried out are not. Votes are bought to-day *en masse*. There is, as things stand, no future for new political ideas outside the two giant parties; while within them they are always liable to be opposed by a great weight of entrenched influence. For example, to-day real hardship is concentrated in those who saved for retirement, taking nothing from the State, and now have diminishing or fixed incomes buying less and less; they, however, can go down the drain unwept, unhonoured and unsung. On the other hand, no attempt will be made to deal with the Co-operative movement. Founded by under-paid working-men (who made teetotalism a principle), it was relieved of income-tax on its dividends on purchases. It has grown into a vast capitalistic organisation (increasingly dealing in alcoholic drinks), competing with capitalists, often small ones, who have to pay income-tax on all dividends.

Workers in trades and professions band together to pursue the interests of their groups, no matter what the effects on the common good may be. This is done by capitalists, professional people, manual workers. The officers of these pressure groups are usually reputable people, good husbands and fathers, but the temptations to put the interests of the group before the well-being of the community are obvious. The manual workers in certain occupations can exert the greatest pressure.

'The last few years have demonstrated that the unionised workers in modern industry possess a power for coercing the community much greater, because more immediate and paralysing, than that ever possessed by the "capitalist," the "financier," the property-owner or bond-holder. No group of railway shareholders, dissatisfied with their dividends, would have dared to say to the nation, "Pay us more money or no train will run." Shareholders, bankers, capitalists, "money monopolists," have no power to carry out such threats, even if they made them.'

Trade unions apply restrictive practices which cost the community dear. The coal-miners got increases on promise of increased output, which was not forthcoming. Twice the National Union of Railwaymen received increases in

---

\* 'The Times Literary Supplement,' July 16, 1954.

return for dropping restrictive practices and twice nothing came of it :

The Devil was ill : the Devil a saint would be.

The Devil was well : the devil a saint was he.

Mr E. H. C. Leather, M.P., who recalled these facts, received letters from all over the country confirming them. One from a former railway employee said :

' For twenty-seven years I was employed as a clerk in the sales department at ——— and can honestly say that for twenty years I never did more than two full days a week. Nobody did—there was not the work to do, and a great deal of what there was was saved up to be done as overtime at higher pay.'

Now wages account for nearly three-quarters of the cost of running the railways.

The pressure brought to bear on the House of Commons is not only fear of the economically interested electorate but also the presence in the House of so many interested parties such as trade unionists. In the parliament of 1945-50, 41 M.P.s were members of one trade union—the Transport and General Workers'. The National Union of Mineworkers pays 150*l.* a year to each miners' M.P. (In former times this would have been regarded as bribery.)

On March 1, 1955, it was announced that the average weekly wages of seven million manual workers in Britain's manufacturing—and in some non-manufacturing—industries had risen since before the war by 223 per cent. Compared with its 1939 value, the pound is worth 8*s.* 5*d.*

One of the most daunting facts is that even so-called educated people become addicts to a slogan and can deal with only one consideration at a time. Equal pay for women is such a fallacy. What is really involved is that the public will be called upon to pay the entire maintenance of children. When family allowances are paid by employers, is this the rate for the job? Can and will the public pay the entire maintenance of children? If it does, there will be a real danger that the people who pay the piper will call the tune. If it does not, will a woman enjoying equal pay be content to share an income deemed adequate only for one person, with inadequate family allowances, or do double work? How does equal pay for women apply to the wife and mother? The answer to the argument that while men are on National Service women

are getting promotion is the conscription of women—it has been given already by women in the medical profession. The blow to family life—and to education by diminishing male recruitment—will be calamitous. If a slump should come, many women, instead of getting higher incomes, will lose their jobs. The monetary cost of equal pay for women will be very great.

The favourite trade-union claptrap is against dividends. In 1954 the total ordinary dividends, net of tax, amounted to 250m.l. ; wages and salaries, net of tax, amounted to 8,000m.l. The total rise in ordinary dividends in the year was 45m.l. ; in wages and salaries, twelve times as much. A great deal of our capital equipment is woefully out of date. Our railways have been allowed to run down and become obsolescent. Our roads are nearly the most overcrowded in the world and fast becoming utterly inadequate. The newest dock in London was being built before 1914.

Death duties are being used for current expenditure, a profligacy that no business would dare to parallel. Mr Charles Morgan has written, 'They cut down fruit-trees because a lot of little boys are yapping for firewood. It makes the cheater feel generous and it wins votes from the little boys—until they find that nothing is left, neither wood nor fruit.'

Yet in our precarious economic position we use large areas of land, large amounts of capital, buildings, plant, labour, fuel, transport, and distribution in turning food into a narcotic drug. This highly civilised nation burns leaves, sucks in the smoke and puffs it out again and spends 800m.l. a year in doing it. In gambling, 600m.l. annually are kept out of, and in retarding, the production of real wealth.

Sir Flinders Petrie pointed out that a civilisation is founded by a military conqueror, who establishes law and order. His generals become the nobility, who in course of time encroach on monarchy. Then rises plutocracy. There is a sequence of phases reaching their apogees in turn—sculpture, painting, literature, music, mechanics, science, wealth. Unequal possessions make it possible for able but less prolific people not to be swamped by the merely more prolific. Then gradually the transformation to democracy takes place. As Mr Charles Morgan has written, 'democracy is greed and indiscipline and the

throttling of the few by the many.' When democracy attains economic power, the majority without capital eat up the capital of the minority.

There are undoubtedly good features in our contemporary life: physical health and well-being, a higher expectation of life, amenities—wireless, television, travel—a certain amount of cultivation, by large numbers, of music, etc. As Mr Aldous Huxley has written, 'No heights or abysses, but plenty of milk for the kids and a reasonably high average IQ and everything, in a quiet, provincial way, cosy and sensible and humane.' But Mr J. B. Priestley in a recent broadcast pointed out that people are now so busy reporting on the bath water that they have not noticed that the baby has been thrown out. 'A lot of people,' he said, 'may be cleaner, neater, and quieter than they used to be, but they also seem sillier and emptier, as if character were draining away. A society may offer a wonderland of mechanical marvels and yet fail disastrously because it consists of people who are losing their zest, imagination, joy, and awe,' and suffer boredom and melancholy and have lost individual strength of character to stand up to their real oppressors, their fellow men who impose conventions on them.

As soon as Western Germany was allowed to build ships, they produced them so cheaply, quickly, and punctually that British shipowners placed orders in German yards. One form of British production that has been in the lead is steel, yet in February, 1955, West German production was 1,629,000 tons and British, 1,601,000. German, Indian, and Japanese competition is on the way.

R. F. RATTRAY.

### Art. 3.—SPAIN. THE LOSS OF A FRIEND.

RECENT events have provided more than ample justification for the consistent defence by this Review of the régime of General Franco and are a vindication of an accurate insight into the affairs of Spain; these last years have provided lamentable evidence of the paralysis of British foreign policy regarding Spain and have seen that country emerge patiently and by her own unaided efforts from the international boycott established on her by the United Nations in 1945/6 at the dictates of Russia. This year has seen her invited to become a permanent observer in the U.N.O. and to become a participant in European defence at the instigation and with the support of the U.S.A. alone.

Critics of Spain are still many and vocal, but facts are prevailing over prejudice in the public mind, if not in that of the Foreign Office. To all appearances the vast majority of Spaniards continue to support the present régime, which has for fifteen years given to them peace and tranquillity and more recently a prosperity possessed by few countries.

The reversal, by most nations outside the Soviet bloc, of the policy of boycott of Spain in 1945/6 into a policy of friendship and co-operation in 1955, with exactly the same régime in power, makes it expedient to recall the events that led up to that boycott.

The Spanish civil war was cleverly misrepresented by a powerful and well-organised propaganda, which depicted it, in the press and news agencies of the world, to be a struggle by a legal democratic constitutional government against a rising of fascist generals; though it was none of these things, the legend was swallowed and believed by a majority of the press and public of Britain and still persists in certain circles. Unfortunately for the avoidance of further falsification of history, from which England has suffered so much in past centuries, most of the English founts of future research on the history of Spain during that period became poisoned and tendentious, as can be seen from the files of the daily press and contemporary publications of Chatham House.

The lessons that could have been learnt about the cold war, which the Soviet tried out in Spain in the 1920's and 1930's, were thus obscured or lost to the world, which was about to suffer and still suffers a similar onslaught. It can

still, however, be of great use to recall the lessons about the technique of Communist hot and cold warfare, which in 1932-6 reached in Spain its ultimate phase and intention in the persecution of religion, massacres of tens of thousands of Christians merely because they were Christians, its Cheka torture chambers, and a general bestiality, in comparison with which the Reign of Terror in the French Revolution was comparatively mild.

The cold war was started in Spain by Lenin in the early twenties and continued actively by Stalin. Published Communist text-books made no secret about its objects, though a remarkable propaganda, which seemed to control the press and the news-agencies, made the world believe that it was a struggle between democracy and fascism, which it was not, except by a complete corruption of those words, being the try-out of the struggle carried on throughout the world to-day between those on one side and the other of the Iron Curtain.

When the Second World War came, there was no doubt that General Franco, like all the non-British world, believed that the Germans must win. There was much controversy and much speculation as to what Spain's sympathies, intentions, and actions had been, until the Nuremberg Trials and Count Ciano's diaries settled the important facts and it was seen that General Franco's chief aim had been to keep his country out of the war and that he had balanced himself with great skill on the tight-rope of neutrality.

After the allied victory General Franco and Spain continued to be the target of Russian and left-wing hatred, and Russia had the ear and sympathies of the world and exploited them ably. At the San Francisco Conference in June 1945, held to form and approve the charter of the United Nations, Spain was categorically excluded from membership, and at Potsdam two months later the powers stated that they would not favour any application for membership by General Franco's government.

Throughout 1945-6 the Spanish question was often discussed in the U.N.O. Bitterness and abuse were poured on Spain, until, in 1946, the power of those behind the cold war and the Marxian tendency of socialists obtained in the U.N. the diplomatic boycott of Spain and the withdrawal of ambassadors. Subsequently, owing to the gradual and

progressive unpopularity of Russia and the growing appreciation of the meaning of Communism and socialism, ever-increasing changes took place in the attitude of the U.N.O. Whereas at San Francisco the fifty participating nations voted unanimously against Spain, in 1950 no less than thirty-eight nations voted in her favour on the question of the cancellation of her diplomatic boycott.

As the military superiority of Russia, her constant activities and successes in the cold war, and the necessity of Spain's assistance to Western defence all became increasingly evident, opinion in the U.S.A. veered further and further in favour of Spain, though unfortunately the French and British governments continued in their prejudice and antipathy to her and had not the grace to acknowledge their past mistakes. Thus it came about that bilateral negotiations took place between the U.S.A. and Spain, resulting in September 1953 in the signature of agreements between the two countries, which in effect brought the powerful forces of Spain into the orbit of Western defence.

It is difficult to ascertain the exact figures of Spain's present defence forces, but their immense importance to Western defence and Spanish anti-communism have made nonsense for some years of the boycott and of British and French policies. A recent reliable authority stated in 1953 that the peace-time strength of the army was twenty-five divisions, amounting to 400,000 men, and that forty-four divisions could be mobilised within thirty-six hours, with a potential mobilisation strength of one-and-a-half millions. Of the peace-time army 65 per cent. were at that date infantry, with fifty regiments of artillery and one tank division. Owing to the boycott of Spain up to the time of the 1953 agreements with the U.S.A., equipment was poor and out of date, but material and arms are now flowing into Spain under those agreements and the forces are being equipped rapidly.

From available information it can be said about the navy and air force that the former then consisted of six old cruisers and eighteen destroyers, with further destroyers and auxiliary vessels under construction and a manpower of some 24,000; the air force had a personnel of 30,000 and some 1,000 planes, mostly of antiquated models.

Past history and the Spanish civil war have proved the

excellence of Spanish soldiers, sailors, and airmen, which, and their numbers, make their acquisition to Western defence of most inestimable value. The Alto Estado Mayor, or High Command, of Spain controls and co-ordinates all the three arms and its head is General Franco.

The agreements signed in 1953 between the U.S.A. and Spain are bringing about a complete reorganisation of these forces. There are three agreements: the first concerns the common use by the two nations of air and naval bases, the second concerns economic aid, and the third mutual military assistance for defence. The aid visualised in the agreement was 226 million dollars for the year ending June 1954, of which \$141 million was earmarked for military purposes and \$85 million for economic aid; subsequent allotments have not so far been revealed. The air and naval bases to be rented were not specified, but subsequent development has shown them to be at Madrid (Torrejón), Barcelona, Seville (San Pablo and Morón), Zaragoza, Cartagena, Ferrol, Cadiz (Rota), and Mahón; Spanish sovereignty over the bases was specifically stipulated and the Spanish flag will fly over them, for the case of Gibraltar is ever present in Spanish minds; the bases are to be developed, maintained, and used for military purposes conjointly by both governments. The agreement covering mutual defence consists of several comprehensive stipulations, bringing Spain into the orbit of the U.S.A. legislation for military, economic, and technical aid, and each country placing at the disposition of the other all necessary equipment, material, and help. It also states its objects to be the maintenance of peace and mutual co-operation for the defence of the free world and the adoption of methods to control the commerce of nations threatening the maintenance of peace.

The general duration of the agreements is for a period of ten years, which will be extended for two further periods of five years unless either side notifies its termination.

Since the signature of the agreements, General Franco has made important declarations in the press and over the radio of the U.S.A. which have shown that consistent vision and comprehension of world affairs and the conflict between East and West, which have in fact been exhibited in his previous declarations on Communism and world affairs. He has stated that the Spanish-American pacts

had added the strength of thirty millions to the defence of the West, that collaboration with the N.A.T.O. had not been envisaged, but that the U.S.A. had now secured the contribution of Spain to the fight of the Christian world against the Soviet menace; that Spain did not think of any co-operation with England and France, because those countries had done nothing towards creating the necessary atmosphere of confidence and cordiality.

In a subsequent declaration he stated that 'If there had not been tension in the relations of Spain with France and England in recent years, it would have been desirable and natural for Spain to have entered the N.A.T.O. This situation has been taken care of by our understanding with Portugal. We have now the Iberian Defence Treaty with Portugal and the latter is of course in the N.A.T.O. In effect, we are in it through Portugal.'\*

It is impossible to deny that General Franco's remarks about British and French policies are justified and it is much to be regretted in view of the friendships that have existed in the past, the close ties between much of the aristocracy of Spain and England, and the long and intimate connections between Spain and England in banking, commerce, industry, mining, and the wine trade. Beyond all these reasons for friendship with one of the most potentially powerful nations of Europe in the vanguard of Christianity and anti-communism, whose assistance is necessary and may be vital in a future war, whether it be hot or cold. There is ample evidence of Spain's return to prominence and prestige, such as she has not enjoyed since the time when she possessed one of the greatest empires in the world. She would be a worthy friend to regain.

After General Franco's remarks about Spain's entry into the N.A.T.O. there came a further proof of the notable reversal of international opinion and a return to reality and common sense. Senator Bridges and twelve other U.S. Senators proposed in June to support the entry of Spain into the N.A.T.O., and the proposal is expected to be discussed by that body in the course of this year with the support of Italy, Turkey, and Greece as well as of the U.S.A.

The realisation of the 1953 agreements has proceeded

---

\* Interview 'U.S. News and World Report,' May 20, 1955.

and is proceeding steadily and well, as far as necessary diplomatic secrecy allows any information to leak out. International (U.S.A. and Spain) commissions to superintend the various activities and constructions were soon established and functioning and visits of important diplomatic, naval, military, and technical personages have been exchanged, including visits by the Spanish Ministers of Commerce and Agriculture to Washington, by the U.S. Secretary of the Navy, by Mr Charles Thomas to Madrid, and by General Muñoz Grandes and Admiral Moreno, Ministers respectively of War and the Navy, to the U.S.A.

The re-equipment of the Spanish army, navy, and air force has proceeded side by side with the development of the air and naval bases, and by the end of 1954 the total financial aid received, military as well as economic, was given in the Spanish press as \$256 millions. American sources have stated that the expected expenditure on air and naval bases alone will be \$300,000,000, including the cost of a 485-mile oil pipe-line from Cadiz to Zaragoza, passing through Seville and Madrid.

It is probable that Gibraltar is at present the most fruitful source of Anglo-Spanish misunderstanding. In these days of political and territorial self-determination, the continued surrender of British conquered possessions to nationalist claims and the leasing by one nation from another of air and naval bases, it is desirable to review the Gibraltar question in some of its aspects.

The objective study of the subject has been much prejudiced in the minds of Englishmen by falsified Whig history learnt at school, by their justifiable pride in Gibraltar's contribution to the greatness of the Empire, and by their ignorance of the Spanish case or refusal to admit that the Spaniards have one.

The British title is well known and is a good one. It originated when Gibraltar capitulated to Sir George Rooke as representative of the Archduke Charles, the eventually defeated candidate to the Spanish throne in the War of the Spanish Succession, on whose side England was fighting. After the surrender, however, Sir George Rooke hoisted over the fortress the British flag instead of that of the Austrian pretender, whom he was serving. Subsequently, the cession of Gibraltar to England was confirmed in the

treaties of Utrecht (1713), Seville (1729), and Versailles (1783).

The Spanish case is based on the illegality of the action of Sir George Rooke, the fact that the Rock is an integral part of Spanish territory, the contention that Spain never consented to the cession of sovereignty, but only of occupation, and Gibraltar's vulnerability under modern conditions to anyone not holding its hinterland.

In the interest of Anglo-Spanish goodwill and understanding, it is necessary that each side should at all events know the opinions of the other and also to point out that Spanish governments and people have in the past, when Great Britain was in straits and required Spanish neutrality or friendship, been led to believe that Great Britain would be prepared to discuss the question of Gibraltar and a possible exchange for a more easily defended strong-point on the opposite coast of Africa, such as Ceuta and its hinterland; that the belief has foundation can be seen by references to the press and speeches of statesmen during the First World War, during the dictatorship of General Primo de Rivera, and subsequently during the Second World War. These suggestions and discussions have never yet reached the question of compensation for the vast amount of British work and expenditure on Gibraltar, and this article does not pretend to strike a balance between the British and Spanish theses, but merely to state them in the cause of mutual understanding.

The middle of 1954 witnessed one of the periods of virulence of the Gibraltar controversy in both Spain and England. The Spanish Foreign Minister stated that a promise had been made to discuss the question of Gibraltar after the war and Mr Churchill in the House of Commons denied that any promise to cede Gibraltar to Spain had been made. The two declarations might appear to be contradictory, but in fact are not so, for Mr Churchill contradicted a statement Spain had never made; the Spanish Foreign Minister published the evidence of British promises made in 1940/42 to discuss the question of Gibraltar on the condition of Spain maintaining her neutrality.

The chief items of his evidence consisted of telegrams to the Spanish government from the Spanish ambassador in London, the Duke of Alba. The first of these, on

July 4, 1940, said (translation): 'that the Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs had declared to him that the English government wishes us to maintain good relations with it and, having appreciated the mistakes in her policy towards Spain in the past, is ready in the future to discuss all our problems and aspirations, including Gibraltar.' The second was on October 2, 1941, and stated (translation): 'Churchill, Eden, and the English ambassador in Madrid (Hoare) and others lunched to-day at the Spanish embassy. The Prime Minister said to me in conversation that it was his wish that Spain should be ever stronger and more prosperous, . . . that if England wins the war, of which there is no doubt, Spain will have the opportunity to be the strongest Mediterranean power, in which she can count with the decided help of England. We are determined, he said, to help Spain in every way and we only ask her not to allow the Germans to cross her territory.'

These are the chief items in the Spanish case and also the belief stated categorically by General Franco, that in 1942, when the Allies required and received the benevolence of Spain for the North African invasion, Britain offered to discuss Gibraltar when the war ended.

In 1952 General Franco, according to the Spanish press, made the suggestion that the Spanish sovereignty of Gibraltar should be recognised by Britain and then leased to her in the similar way that bases are being leased elsewhere.

But Gibraltar is only one cause of estrangement between Spain and Britain. There are the long-standing irritants of the false black legend of sixteenth-century Spain, of Spain's intense Catholicism, and more recently the hostility of the Foreign Office and of the U.N.O. There is also the tendency to xenophobia in both nations and the false but able left-wing propaganda. Spain has not forgotten that, when all decent Spaniards were fighting their crusade with their backs to the wall against the Red Terror, the British refused to allow them belligerent rights and assisted their enemies to run their blockade.

At the end of 1954 important events took place regarding the succession to the monarchy in Spain. Both in all recent Spanish legislation and in General Franco's speeches, Spain is always recognised as continuing to be a kingdom

(*reino*), and these events did not signify any new departure but were merely within the established framework of the Franco régime. Prince Juan Carlos, with his younger brother, the Infante Alfonso, has been educated in Spain in accordance with the agreement between their father, Don Juan, and General Franco. In 1954 he concluded his university career and took his degree. He is seventeen years old and, though his succession is not certain until, according to the laws of succession, he is thirty years old, he is being groomed for the kingship of Spain to succeed General Franco if he is approved when the time comes. Don Juan is thought and spoken of by Spanish monarchists as 'El Rey' and has never renounced his claim to the throne, but he is eliminated as General Franco's successor because the régime, which, under the law of succession he must swear to continue, is unacceptable to him and consequently he is unacceptable to General Franco; he considers himself king by right of descent, so he cannot consent to the semi-elective condition of the law of succession.

Negotiations took place and eventually a meeting between Don Juan and General Franco took place in December 1954 at the country house in Estremadura of the Count of Ruiseñada, a prominent monarchist and an intimate friend of Don Juan.

The outcome has been that what can be called a royal household has been set up in Madrid around the young prince, who will now do his military training in the military academy. The chief of the establishment is a distinguished general, Martinez Campos, Duque de la Torre, who has professional, clerical, and military aides as tutors. The prince is housed in the palace of the Duke of Montellano in the Paseo de la Castellana Madrid, which has been lent by the duke for the purpose. Both the general and the duke are ardent monarchists, as indeed are nearly all the Spanish aristocracy, though the majority simultaneously support General Franco on account of the prosperity, order, and safety against communism that his régime has given to Spain. The Falangists showed some restlessness and criticism of this step forwards towards monarchy, and were met by a declaration on the part of General Franco to the effect that monarchy has been the historical system of Spain and was accepted in the plebiscite by the

overwhelming majority of the Spanish people, but that the revived monarchy would be in accord with the principles of the movement (Falange) and would not be a return to the liberal parliamentary system which had served Spain so badly in the past.

This was an example of the General's consistent policy since the Civil War of keeping a balance between left and right. Spain is, like other countries, split between lefts and rights, but with the difference that there are no political parliamentary parties as such: the lefts are Falangist, republican and socialist, while the rights are Catholic, conservative and monarchist.

Much of the London press failed to understand the significance of the arrangement over the prince; this held no new policy but was a consistent sequence to the law of succession, of the details of which the press seemed to have misinformed themselves.

The law of succession was approved by the Cortes in 1947 and then submitted to a national referendum which gave it a 90 per cent. majority.

The chief conditions of the law were:

(1) The setting up of a Council of the Kingdom presided over by the President of the Cortes and composed of the Primate, the Commander-in-Chief, the President of the Council of State, the Chief Justice, the President of the Spanish Institute, and elected members of the Cortes, of the universities, of the professional colleges, the syndicates, and the municipalities.

(2) In the case of death or incapacity, the head of the state is to be succeeded by the person who shall be chosen by the combined council of the kingdom and the government and accepted by two-thirds of the Cortes; in the event of no suitable person being found, a regent is to be named.

(3) As soon as the headship of the state is vacant a regency council is to be called consisting of the President of the Cortes, the Primate and the Captain-general of the forces, who must settle the name of the new ruler within three days.

(4) The head of the state must be a male of royal blood, Spanish and Catholic, and over thirty years of age; he must swear to observe the fundamental laws of the régime, the citizens' charter, the labour charter, the constitution of

the Cortes, and the laws of referendum and succession.

The Council of the Kingdom (*Consejo del Reino*) was constituted a few months after the passing of the law of succession, which was a democratic procedure if the honestly ascertained will of the majority is a true demonstration of the right meaning of that much-abused word.

Such is the legal position in Spain regarding the succession, which has attempted to foresee and neutralise many of the usual dangers consequent on the end of a dictatorship.

Some London papers, with their suspicion of anything Spanish, attributed the events concerning the young prince to a new and machiavellian policy of political chicanery on the part of General Franco, for which there is no evidence. His history, his words and deeds throughout his career, and the legislation of his régime for the past fifteen years prove the General's monarchist sentiments and the consistency of his policies.

In answer to his critics at home and abroad General Franco made in March 1955 a statement to the press which outlined the historical importance of the monarchy to Spain throughout the centuries. He eulogised the life and character of King Alfonso XIII and his mother, Queen Maria Cristina, depicting them as victims of the Spanish political system, which they were powerless to alter in spite of their many virtues and qualities. Like many another historian, he traced the decadence of Spanish government and politicians to the system of parliamentary government imported into Spain from England and France some 150 years ago. It is difficult for any student of history to deny that the system proved completely unsuitable to the Spanish temperament and led to the corrupt republic and civil war. The present régime is built up on the ideas of unity without parliamentary political parties, a democracy with perpendicular representation, a parliament, a head of the state with a council of state to advise him and name his successor. General Franco stated that the régime founded on the movement (*Falange*) had been successful and stable; that it is always open to improvement, but must not be diverted from its principles; he demonstrated at length that monarchy and the tenets of the *Falange* were complementary one to the other.

As *Falange* incorporated many ex-republicans and

ex-socialists, who are not likely to change their spots, they are doubtless restless and discontented at the monarchist manifestations, but withal Spaniards, though as uncompromisingly individualistic as ever, are to-day probably more united than at any time in recent years. Future history will prove whether or not the aim of Spanish unity can be permanently realised. British opinion has been much led astray by believing that Falange is synonymous with fascism of the Hitler type, when it is in reality something very different and the representative of left-wing ideas.

Two occurrences have recently revived the memories of how Spain was made bankrupt and her riches stolen by her enemies during the civil war, a situation from which she was able to retrieve herself without foreign aid by her own remarkable courage and perseverance. These two events were : the rape of all the gold reserves of the Bank of Spain by certain of the republican ministers in October 1936 and the theft of the enormous treasure of jewels, pictures, and bonds accumulated by them and shipped to Mexico in the yacht ' Vita ' on the final republican defeat in 1939. One of the recent occurrences that has revived these stories is the notification by the Spanish government that it has reason to believe that Russia is now utilising the stolen gold for international payments and that Spain will contest its ownership in the Court of International Justice against the countries that receive it. The other occurrence is a published declaration by Indalecio Prieto, one of the chief architects of the revolution and the republic and one of the ministers chiefly concerned in the disposal of the treasure in Mexico ; he was also a minister at the time the gold was shipped to Russia. He now attempts to disculpate himself by throwing all the blame on the then Prime Minister, Dr Negrín, with whom he quarrelled over the booty in Mexico in 1939.

The gold of the Bank of Spain, which at the time was worth 156½ millions and constituted the total guarantee for Spain's currency, was shipped to Odessa from Cartagena in 7,800 cases under the personal direction of Negrín and never heard of again. Negrín was the member of the republican government most closely allied to Moscow and communism ; the robbery was shrouded in secrecy and the details are only now revealed by Prieto. He says that

four employees of the Bank of Spain accompanied the gold to Odessa, where it was carefully weighed and delivered to the Russian Grosbank, and that these employees were never seen again in Spain; he also relates that the Russian officials who intervened in the transaction also disappeared or were liquidated. His intimate knowledge of the names and details make it hard to believe that he did not share in Negrín's operation.

The story of the 'Vita' treasure is not so shrouded in secrecy owing to the squabble that took place in the press of Paris between Negrín and Prieto in 1939 and the description given in his book 'Men and Politics' by Louis Fisher, the associate and intimate of Negrín.

The treasure was an accumulation of jewellery and art treasures stolen from the sacristies, the houses, or bank deposits of the refugees who had fled from the Red terror and the fruits of the domiciliary visits or of the corpses during the terror. It was estimated by Fisher to be worth \$50,000,000, in addition to boxes of stocks and bonds, and was stored in the fortress of Figueras, and, when General Franco swept north to the frontier, it was transported by Negrín's orders to a fashionable villa in Deauville inhabited by a well-dressed number of apparently fashionable people. On one night in February 1939 these people put on working clothes and carried the cases containing the treasure on board the yacht 'Vita', which set sail for Mexico flying the flag of Panama and under the orders of Colonel Puente.

It had been arranged by Negrín that the treasure was to be delivered for his account to President Cardenas of Mexico, but Puente was one of Prieto's men and sent a radio message to him in Mexico, where Prieto was in exile. The result was that on its arrival in a Mexican port the 'Vita's' cargo was delivered not to President Cardenas but to Prieto. Then began the pull-devil-pull-baker for its possession between Prieto and Negrín; details of the treasure's later history are veiled in secrecy, but of two things there is certainty; the real owners of the stolen goods will never see them and much of the proceeds went to support the campaign of the 'Republican government in exile' before the United Nations and the chancelleries of the powers, besides providing luxurious living for some of the exiled politicians.

ARTHUR F. LOVEDAY.

#### Art. 4.—GLADSTONE AS A 'QUARTERLY REVIEW' CONTRIBUTOR.

DURING his long life William Ewart Gladstone (whose biography by Sir Philip Magnus proved a distinguished book of last year) was not entirely absorbed in politics. In his earlier years he frequently sought relief from his official duties by transferring his intellect from speech-making to literary excursions in the medium of monthly periodicals; and it was with one special journal, the 'Quarterly Review,' that he experienced a particularly intimate and cordial association as a writer. Towards the end of my article on 'John Gibson Lockhart: Editor and Biographer' ('Quarterly,' October 1954) I mentioned that Gladstone contributed to the Review during the last decade of Lockhart's tenure of the editorial chair and for a considerable time later. As a fact, Gladstone's twenty contributions appeared from 1844 to 1876; about half of them fell within Lockhart's period and half within that of Lockhart's successor, Whitwell Elwin. His letters,\* hitherto unpublished, to both these editors reveal him as man of letters, a feature which, naturally, could not be encompassed by his biographers, John Morley and Sir Philip Magnus, but which is of considerable importance for a complete understanding of Gladstone's complex personality. The letters throw some new light on his religious and political views and on his versatility of interest in literary matters.

The first letter (incomplete), written to Lockhart on Dec. 10, 1844, from Newark, where Gladstone had been elected in 1841, concerns his first article, on 'The Ideal of a Christian Church' ('Quarterly,' December 1844), reviewing a Romanist treatise by W. G. Ward, the Roman Catholic theologian who was deprived of his Oxford degree for heresy the following year. Obviously Gladstone wanted to make a good appearance with this first contribution, and, finding it troublesome to curb his tendency to diffuseness, showed great deference to Lockhart's judgment in the matter of curtailment. 'After labouring to the best of my power,' he wrote, 'to retouch and indeed reconstruct the latter part of my paper according to the terms of the conversation between us, I requested also to see it in print

---

\* They are in the National Library of Scotland.

that I might have another opportunity of judging whether I had come up to your views and intentions. . . . The retrenchment effected in the revision is I fear of not more than four (review) pages—of the proof, about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  are cut off, and some others shortened. For further retrenchments I would suggest to your consideration the parts I have scored in pencil down the margin.' After specifying five alterations, he added: 'On the whole though I am quite willing to accept whatever you may (after our conversation) think necessary, I feel that this work of abbreviation is very difficult in the paper generally, for though great space is occupied in exhibiting Mr Ward's book and in arguments *ad hominem*, I do not think the rest would be intelligible without it.'

Ward had been a follower of John Henry Newman, and in the next letter, written from Hawarden Castle on Dec. 20, Gladstone introduces Newman, who in 1845 gave up Anglicanism and was received into the Roman Church: 'I greatly regret the alteration of the sentence with regard to Mr Newman. It did not touch the question of honesty but passed it by. . . . Further it is with regard to his philosophy that I think Ward has caricatured Newman. As to his divinity generally I do not know whether he has learned much from him or not. As the passage stands I am afraid I may be understood to charge Newman with Ward's philosophy, which to speak frankly I cannot undertake to do.

'The announcements from Oxford have caused me some painful misgivings in connection with this article. I cannot bear the thought of running down a man when the cry is already full upon him: and my fear is lest my attack should be taken as part of the indictment & should practically influence men's minds to vote against him upon a question wholly separate. I could not on this ground ask you to deviate from the tone of the article: but I do beg you to allow me a little to amplify a sentiment it already contains, namely that my discussion does not in any manner touch the question on which he is to be tried. . . . With these explanations, I acquiesce in all your retrenchments, though in one or two cases I feel the yearnings of parental affection: & pray accept my thanks for the kindness and candour of your whole proceeding as well as for the value of your remarks in other points of view in which it is presumptuous for me even to have an opinion upon them.'

Conscious of his own limitations in historical knowledge, Gladstone, writing to Lockhart on Aug. 18, 1845, declined

his suggestion of reviewing the 'Memoirs and Correspondence' of George Lyttelton, 1st Baron Lyttelton. 'I should do *you* injustice because I have nothing like the thorough and familiar knowledge of the history of the period in which Lord Lyttelton lived, that the reviewer of the book ought to possess.' He then reverts to Ward. 'I understand that Mr Ward, the subject of our old correspondence, is about to accomplish his meteorlike career by joining the Church of Rome. Last year he made disavowals meant to sound strong. Perhaps this may not be the end of him. He began you know as a favourite pupil and thoroughgoing follower of Dr Arnold.'

In these letters, and in many of his 'Quarterly' articles, Gladstone shows a remarkable command of ecclesiastical affairs. The most abstruse definitions of Christian doctrine, the distinctions of Augustinianism and Pelagianism, of Calvinism and Arminianism, of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century theology, of the Anglican and Presbyterian modes, of the Evangelical and the Oxford schools, are all at his fingers' ends. He writes as an Anglo-Catholic who refuses to countenance Roman Catholicism, and it was for him a matter of deep regret when some of his friends became converts to Rome. For instance, writing in 1845 to Edward Lowth Badeley, the ecclesiastical lawyer, who was to withdraw from the English Church to the Roman communion in 1850, Gladstone refers to Newman's 'Essay on Christian Doctrine' in these words:

'I had imagined that the appearance of Newman's book must be with many a subject of eager expectation. I think that of all those scarcely any could have been more horrorstruck than I was, over two years ago, by the first intimation. I also agree with you it is the greatest blow struck for & by the Church of Rome in England & in direct matter of religion since the Reformation. I still remain like you very anxious for the *argument*: I say for the argument because now for as much as five or six years Newman has lost, with my mind, that sort of authority which depends upon judgment as apart from argument: in short the date of that change in my view of him was first the publication of Froude (in statu quo) and secondly & mainly the defence of the publication as a right & sound measure. I may be wrong, but I speak of it as a fact which I made known to others at the time.'\*

---

\* On Feb. 6, 1896, Gladstone wrote to E. S. Purcell, the biographer of Manning: 'Though I could not claim to be his [Newman's] friend, I received

Hoping that Badeley has judged rightly in believing he ought to join the Roman Church for the salvation of his soul, Gladstone wrote to him on July 22, 1852 :\*

'The innumerable divisions, the Erastian constitution, the heretical Bishops & Clergy, the total want of discipline, the inconsistent teaching, so far as they can be truly predicted of the Church of England, have in my long established conviction assumed by far their darkest & most formidable features from, nay rather owe many of those features to, the act which you & many before you have done for conscience' sake.'

Adhering strongly to such views, it was natural that Gladstone should be attracted to an anonymous work of fiction [attributed to Miss E. F. S. Harris] entitled 'From Oxford to Rome,' which, appearing in 1847, intended to explain the numerous conversions of that time. About this he wrote to Lockhart on Feb. 16 :

'I cannot resist the impulse which I feel to call your attention to a little book with a not very promising title "From Oxford to Rome" . . . which I happened to *open* from the circumstance of its having been sent to me and to which having opened it I found myself rivetted. It purports to be the work of one who has abandoned the Church of England for the Church of Rome and who has discovered and bitterly laments his error, and seeks earnestly to deter others from the like, but yet has not returned to his former position. I am far from thinking this position (whether it represent an actual case or not) well founded in reason : but the book appears to me likely to do great good, and also to attract deep interest. I think it one of the most eloquent and touching works I have read, and one of the most dispassionate and comprehensive in its view of the unhappy course of things which it principally describes. Your experience and penetration would probably enable you at once to see into the book so far as regards the personality and position of the author. On those subjects I do not presume to draw any conclusion : but I think that the copious analysis of mind and conduct which it contains demonstrates that the writer knows in some sort from experience the subject which he discusses. However I will simply ask you to look at it : with the hope undoubtedly that you

---

from him much kindness, and his character attracted affection as his genius commanded admiration.' The 'Froude' is probably 'The Remains of R. Hurrell Froude' (1838).

\* These hitherto unpublished letters to Badeley are in the National Library of Scotland.

may think it worthy of being reviewed, and that becoming extensively known it may operate widely and powerfully as a warning both against similar changes, and against contracting those predispositions of which the changes are simply the ripeness.'

In his review ('Quarterly,' June 1847) Gladstone gave vent to his deep conviction that the English Church was superior to that of Rome. According to him, the Roman Church 'offers us a sealed Bible; a mutilated Eucharist; an arbitrarily expanded modern creed; a casuistry that "sows pillows to all arm-holes," and is still open to the reproach of Pascal, that, while it aspires to the services of virtue, it does not disdain that of vice; a scheme of worship involving constant peril of polytheistic idolatry; a doctrinal system disparaging Scripture, and driving her acutest champions upon the most dangerous and desperate theories; and a rule of individual discipline which offends against duty even more than against liberty, by placing the reins of the inward and outward life, given by God to conscience, in the hands of an extraneous person under the name of a Director'. Again, 'the Roman Church no longer subjects recreant nuns to the fate of Constance in "Marmion"; but by means of Direction she has almost as effectual powers of bearing down disappointment and repugnance'. And, in summing up, he referred to 'that deep, but rather demoniacal saying of Gibbon, that the vices of the priestly order are less dangerous than the virtues.'

In a previous article on 'The Life of Blanco White' ('Quarterly,' June 1845), Gladstone had assailed White, who, finding it impossible to believe in the Trinity, adopted Unitarian views. Here, curiously enough, Gladstone's most frequent quotations of poetry are from Shelley, and he classes the poet among those 'opponents of the Christian faith who do not disguise the bitterness of the fruits which they have reaped from the poisoned seed of their false imagination.' On the other hand, White 'with his understanding in part . . . even to the last embraced the idea of a personal or quasi-personal God. . . . But others, as far advanced as himself, in the destruction of faith, have made efforts as vigorous to keep some hold of some notion of immortality.'

The same remarkable insight into Church matters

informs Gladstone's article on 'Scotch Ecclesiastical Affairs' ('Quarterly,' December 1845). Although he thinks it impossible 'to find a region in which, relatively to its population, there is a greater amount of active convictions upon the subject-matter of religion' than Scotland, he deplores the harmful books then being read by the artisan class. 'It is certainly no good augury that infidel works should, as we believe to be the case, be largely read in cheap and popular editions by the mechanics and operatives of the great towns of Scotland. The small bookshops which there, as with us, expose to view the intellectual stimulants offered to the people, and which in London abound in extravagant caricatures and more or less scurrilous political publications, in Glasgow are supplied with subtler and more deleterious matter in the productions of foreign and domestic unbelievers.' Later, in discussing Romanism and Presbyterianism, he concludes: 'The Romish communion in Scotland . . . has no substantive Scottish character, and must be regarded simply as a branch or twig of the papal tree fed from without . . . The whole Presbyterianism of Scotland . . . has been entirely unprogressive . . . It has had, on the one hand, no Pietists; on the other, no Rationalists, no Friends of Light, no elasticity of thought or opinion, no desire to develop and appropriate a theology for itself.' But he favours the Scottish Episcopalians, for 'the same uncalculating desperate fidelity, which has ever formed the glory, especially of the Highland character, and which shed so much grace and lustre around the struggles and last history of the Jacobites, is reproduced, and again presented to us, in the ecclesiastical character of the Scottish Episcopal Communion.'

The last letter to Lockhart, dated June 1, 1847, contains another lengthy discussion of an ecclesiastical nature, this time concerning the authorities of the Roman Church:

'I believe that the distinction in rank and authority among different documents or documentary books of religion in the Church of Rome is universally recognised. The Canons of the Council of Trent have the very first place: next to them come the Creed of Pius V and the Catechism of the Council which was not drawn up by the Council itself. The Catechism is more corrupt, as we should say, than the Canons, not much less corrupt than (for instance) the Encyclical letters of Gregory XVI. . . . I believe even the highest ultramontane, holding the

infallibility of the Pope, would still draw a distinction in favour of the Tridentine Canons as compared with the authorities to which I have last referred. . . . A lower class than those I have named, & more open to rebuke, are the works of their standard writers & saints. Among them are found the Psalter of Bonaventura and other productions of a description very shocking to us, and perhaps more operative among them than other more scientific works of far higher theoretic authority . . . The Church I fear kept the Toleration Act as narrow as possible : she then *clutched* the Dissenters and now is clutched by them in return, I mean when they, as is now the case, claim the right systematically to enjoy her ordinances while they systematically repudiate her laws.'

He concludes the letter with an appreciative response to Lockhart's consideration of him as a 'Quarterly' contributor. 'I have great pleasure in receiving your commendation for docility : but I assure you that I have, besides a strong genial sense of the necessity of discipline for a *corps* like yours, been much impressed with your liberality & cordiality of dealing towards me, and very anxious not to try to take the smallest advantage of it. But though I have had this anxiety I do not feel that I have at any time been called by you to act in such a way as to claim the least merit on this score, and therefore though gratified with your opinion I scarcely feel entitled to appropriate it.'

These letters and articles reveal how Gladstone's tortuous mind tackled the religious questions of the day. Earlier in life his attitude had changed from Evangelical to High Church, it became unsympathetic to Presbyterianism, and, as time went on, he showed increasing and then complete opposition to Roman Catholicism. He was cut to the heart when his friend, James Hope-Scott of Abbotsford, became a convert to Rome. But evidently some people were convinced that Gladstone was more favourably disposed to the Roman Church than he admitted himself to be. For instance, I have discovered a hitherto unpublished letter,\* written from Cheshire on Feb. 3, 1870, from one James Kennedy to the anonymous writer [G. R. Gleig] of an article on Gladstone's career which had appeared in 'Blackwood's Magazine' for February 1870. Marked

---

\* It is in the Blackwood Papers in the National Library of Scotland. Liverpool was, of course, Gladstone's birthplace.

'private & confidential,' the letter is very outspoken on the religious side of Gladstone's character :

'Your deductions,' Kennedy wrote, 'are good as to his motives so far as they go but you appear to omit a stronger motive still. Do you not remember his nearly going to Rome with his two clever friends, Hope Scott & Manning (I think it was) when they became perverts? Ordinary Romanism might avail with Gladstone's variable mind but with the two others there must have been at some time, before or after, an affiliation with the Society of Jesuits I think. As regards Gladstone, I speak from memory only, but I lived in Liverpool then (& my wife's family were playfellows of Gladstone & some of my brothers-in-law were his schoolfellows—he is called Ewart after my wife's uncle). I have a perfect recollection that at that time his sister became a Roman Catholic & now is so, & he was only prevented from taking the same step by the firmness of his father Sir John . . .

'I have for years past held the opinion that he is not only a Roman Catholic & an affiliated Jesuit but that he holds a *Dispensation* to sail under false colours. I have been called uncharitable & absurd but since the Irish Church Bill was first mooted I have met with others on various occasions who, tho' not knowing his earlier history, have like myself looked up thro' effects to the cause of his abominable conduct as a professed protestant. If this be an opinion founded on fact what are the Dissenters laying up for themselves if after a series of his manœuvres thro' the highest & lowest classes he gets Romanism (Transmontane) made the Established Religion of our present benighted country?'

Eight years elapsed before Gladstone began to correspond with Whitwell Elwin. In the interval he wrote for the 'Quarterly' five articles, of which that on 'Giacomo Leopardi' ('Quarterly,' March 1850) calls for remark. Valuing highly Leopardi's work, he observed: 'When we regard Leopardi in his character as a poet . . . it is not difficult to perceive that he was endowed in a peculiar degree with most of the faculties which belong to the highest excellence.' But, religious evaluation ousting purely literary appreciation, he lamented that Leopardi had no faith in 'the Gospel revelation,' and in that respect he compared him unfavourably with Wordsworth.

For the most part, the letters to Elwin discuss political topics, and the first one, from Downing Street on April 19, 1855, conveys Gladstone's readiness to write on the

Sardinian question. An Italian writer desires to translate and publish it in a Turin publication. 'I conclude neither you nor Mr Murray would object to facilitate the early publication in Italian of an article from the Quarterly; but I apprehend Signor M. would wish to be at liberty to say the article was by me.'\* In the article, 'Sardinia and Rome' ('Quarterly,' June 1855), Gladstone strongly upheld Cavour's Government in its struggle for independence as against Papal control.

On Sept. 28 and Oct. 11, 1856, he informed Elwin about his proposed treatment of material for 'The Declining Efficiency of Parliament' ('Quarterly,' September 1856):

'The difficulty of the Article,' he wrote, 'lies much more in the general handling I think than in particular passages: as I feel it, it arises out of this, that the crippled & disorganised state of the Conservative Party in the House of Commons is a main part of the evil, & a part which cannot properly be laid bare by me nor perhaps by anyone in the "Quarterly." I have conscientiously endeavoured to treat this subject with all the delicacy I could.'

In the second letter his enthusiasm for the 'Quarterly' is interspersed among further observations on the current political scene:

'Let me beg you to understand that my judgment against further discussion in the article of the state of the Conservative party was simply an expression of my opinion that such a task in such a place was not one for me . . . I feel so much of weakness & darkness that I can hope for little more than for a good conscience in performing duty as it emerges into view from day to day. But as to the Review, which is a very important organ of opinion, I hope & believe it will meet no insuperable difficulty in pursuing the path, as opportunities may offer, which this article may be said to open. In so doing I feel convinced it will confer real service both upon the party it most approves, & on the country . . . A sincere interest in the prosperity of the Review continues with a disinclination to presume in politics to make me glad that your suggestion should be acted on.'

The continuation of political themes now gives opportunity for onslaughts against Palmerston and his Government and a subtle evasion of responsibility for the origin of the attacks. On Jan. 1, 1857, these ideas relate to

---

\* The 'Quarterly' articles still remained unsigned.

'Prospects Political and Financial,' which appeared in the January number:

'I confess that quite irrespectively of the question whether the actual posture of public affairs may tend to co-operation with the funds of Lord Derby or otherwise, every day strengthens my conviction that Lord Palmerston is a *bad* minister for this country in every sense: bad legislatively, bad financially, and bad morally... In case the authorship of the following Article should be fastened on me, it will have been better I think that it was done by a person *not* in communication with Lord D. & his friends.'

It would seem that the article on 'The New Parliament and Its Work' ('Quarterly,' April 1857) is anticipated in the letter of March 27, when Elwin was informed:

'It would be practicable, and interesting, to draw out much of political truth from Guizot's Peel\* nor do I *despair* of doing this in a manner that might suit the Q.R. but it leads me on tender ground, & naturally prompts a distribution of praise & blame in accounting for our present political evils. At the present moment looking upon *dishonour* as the great characteristic of Lord Palmerston's Govt. I would not willingly run the *risk* of wounding Lord Derby or any friend of his & I should be glad with your permission to take more time to consider how best to handle this subject.'

On March 5, 1858, Gladstone's discussion with Elwin about Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, who began the controversy over the famous 'Essays and Reviews' by an article in the 'Quarterly Review' condemning the book, serves as a means for more censure of the

'Romanising habit of mind or the cravings which drive men in that direction. My fear is founded upon the knowledge that the very mention of the name Rome is like pouring poison into any discussion of ecclesiastical matters. . . . If you knew the Bishop of Oxford as I do, & saw the *working* of his whole system inside and out you would acquit both him & all he does. . . . The fruit of his government seems really to have been to have put out & extinguished the whole Romanising sentiment . . . wherever his influence abounds, and that by gentle means . . . On such a man as this I am quite certain you would be the last . . . to fix . . . any part of the stigma which justly attaches to men that either by weakness or by wantonness betray or predispose others to betray the Church of

---

\* 'Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel,' by François P. G. Guizot (1857).

England . . . Anything said in the Quarterly speaks very differently upon him & his influence from what is said in the Record.\*

From Haddo House, Aberdeen, on October 1, he sends alterations for his article on 'The Past and Present Administrations' ('Quarterly,' October 1858), adding :

'I should be sorry if my authorship of this paper stood in the way of any insertion into it which you might desire. But, heartily wishing well to the Review as I do, were it only for your sake and our friend Mr Murray's, I feel that it would be a grave and critical matter were it to undertake the task of indicating *personal* changes in the arrangements of the Government . . . P.S. From a tour in Western Sutherland, I have unfortunately missed Brougham's oration : but from extracts I suppose it to be most remarkable, and I am sure it lost nothing from missing my criticisms.'

It is hard to say to which of Brougham's speeches Gladstone here refers.†

Before setting out on a special Government mission to the Ionian Islands, Gladstone, finding that his article contained printer's errors, wrote from Hawarden on October 30 : 'I beg your pardon if through Mr Murray I have led you to believe that I was *annoyed* about the misprints in the Quarterly. I had only a kind of tickling & whimsical mortification, like some of those bodily sensations at which one does not know whether to laugh or cry. It was also one which in a case like this was healthful enough for me as an author : but I know you would be vexed to see the Review for once failing in its well-known accuracy of typography.'

On the morning of his return from the Islands he wrote from 11 Carlton House Terrace on March 8, 1859, suggesting 'a short article—say 24 to 28 pages—on Lombardy. My reason for asking is this : that I have found the national question uppermost there and that I think that country is entitled to English sympathy if & so far as she is made by the Austrian Govt. the beast of burden for the Empire.'

\* The Anglican paper edited by Edward Garbett.

† About this time Elwin was a frequent visitor at Brougham Hall 'and used to supply, and even at times invent, suitable quotations for Brougham's addresses to the Social Science Congress.' 'Lord Brougham' by G. T. Garratt (1935), p. 338.

The paper materialised as 'The War in Italy' ('Quarterly,' April 1859).

With the exception of the criticism on Leopardi, hitherto Gladstone's 'Quarterly' contributions, as we have seen, were confined to religious and political themes. In all these writings there has been depth and force of sentiment, frequent vigour and eloquence, but too often a clumsiness of style. When, however, he came to write on Tennyson's recently published 'Idylls of the King,' along with some of his earlier volumes of verse, he seemed to become suffused with an elevated, poetic glow and his style was impressed by a more literary flavour. To Elwin he wrote on August 16, 1859 :

'Will you let me try my hand on a review of Tennyson for your next Number? I have never been fanatical about him : but his late work has laid hold of me with a power that I have not felt, I ought to say have not suffered, for many years. . . . It seems to me that Tennyson has now, especially by this book, taken such a place as a poet that he demands fresh & signal notice from the Review as a duty that it can hardly omit. But in saying this I go rather beyond my office.'

The review duly appeared in the Number for October 1859 :

'In 1850,' Gladstone observed, 'Mr Tennyson gave to the world, under the title of "In Memoriam," perhaps the richest oblation ever offered by the affection of friendship at the tomb of the departed. . . . What can be a nobler tribute than this, that for seventeen years after his [Hallam's] death a poet, fast rising towards the lofty summits of his art, found that young fading image the richest source of his inspiration, and of thoughts that gave him buoyancy for a flight such as he had not hitherto attained? . . . The poem has this mark of greatness, that, though the singer is himself a large part of the subject, it never degenerates into egotism—for he speaks typically on behalf of humanity at large, and in his own name, like Dante on his mystic journey, teaches deep lessons of life and conscience to us all. By the time "In Memoriam" had sunk into the public mind, Mr Tennyson had taken his rank as our first then living poet. . . . We ourselves, with some thousands of other spectators, saw him receive in that noble structure of Wren, the theatre of Oxford, the decoration of D.C.L. . . . Among his colleagues in the honour were Sir De Lacy Evans and Sir John Burgoyne, fresh from the stirring

exploits of the Crimea ; but even patriotism, at the fever heat of war, could not command a more fervent enthusiasm for the old and gallant warriors than was evoked by the presence of Mr Tennyson.'

In his comments on the 'Idylls' Gladstone draws attention to

'Mr Tennyson's extraordinary felicity and force in the use of metaphor and simile. This gift appears to have grown with his years, alike in abundance, truth, and grace . . . We have rarely seen the power subjected to a greater trial than in . . . Mr Tennyson.'

The estimate is summed up in these words :

'An extraordinary master of diction, he has confined himself to its severe and simple forms. . . . No poet has evinced a more despotic mastery over intractable materials, or has been more successful in clothing what is common with the dignity of his art. . . . The music and the just and pure modulation of his verse carry us back not only to the fine ear of Shelley, but to Milton and to Shakespeare : and his powers of fancy and of expression have produced passages which, if they are excelled by that one transcendent and ethereal poet of our nation whom we have last named, yet could have been produced by no other English minstrel.'

There is a rather surprising attitude to his writings expressed in a kind of valedictory in Gladstone's last letter to Elwin on Oct. 29, 1859, when he declared : 'I have an especial repugnance to examining my own compositions when in print, whether they are in the form of a Bill for Parliament or any other.' Elwin resigned from the 'Quarterly' editorship the following year, 1860, but Gladstone contributed three further articles to the journal during the seventies, his last paper being on 'Macaulay' in the Number for July 1876.

W. M. PARKER.

Art. 5.—TWO MINOR VICTORIAN NOVELISTS: LADY  
GEORGIANA FULLERTON AND MRS NORTON.

THE title of 'Minor Victorian Novelists' may suggest something both prim and dim—shadowy figures producing a milk-and-watery fiction; genteel ladies ignoring the cruder facts of life. Such an impression is far from the truth. The two heroines of this study were women of singular force of character, individual to a degree rarely encouraged nowadays. They made a name in social work as well as in literature; they were both women of the world; and one of them was, while still in this life, a citizen of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Lady Georgiana Fullerton and Mrs Norton deserve revival; for their novels, in spite of diversions and divagations (which never worried the Victorian reader), are readable and even exciting. The female novelist of the nineteenth century was rarely, if ever, objective. Jane Austen would seem to have been cast in a unique and perfect mould. Her exquisite detachment, her absolute creation of a small vivid world were not to be achieved by any of her successors, even by the genius of the Brontës or the massive intellect of George Eliot; still less by the women of minor talent. Their work is subjective; through all the texture of the story the pattern of personal feeling and experience can be traced, and that quality is very apparent in both Caroline Norton and Lady Georgiana. In the former the experience was one of suffering.

She was the lovely and brilliant granddaughter of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, sister of the equally lovely Lady Dufferin and the Duchess of Somerset, and she flashes through the Victorian scene like a heroine of sad romance. She was born in 1808, and so is really a Georgian, with the spirit and elegance of the Regency about her. Her marriage, to the Hon. George Norton, was unhappy, though the wife for years tried gallantly to keep up some appearance of amity, and the husband had no scruples about profiting by his wife's friendships with men in place and power, especially with Lord Melbourne. He quarrelled and made scenes; and finally did her the grievous injury of bringing a divorce-suit against her, naming Melbourne as co-respondent. The suit failed. But to come within even measuring distance of divorce in

those days was to be contaminated and left suspect. Then her separation from her husband meant separation, for most of the year, from her children: a grief deeply felt, and which found some relief in her writing her plea in verse for the children held captive in the slavery of mines and factories. Mrs Norton must share with Lord Shaftesbury the credit of alleviating the lot of those miserable infants, of awakening England's sluggish conscience. Her own wrongs also drove her to writing pamphlets and to propaganda that produced some measure of justice in the Custody of Children Act.

Her poverty drove her to writing frankly and honestly, for money; she was a pioneer in journalism, editing the popular Keepsake Albums, writing copious verse, and her novels. In these her own emotional experience dominates the plot: in 'Stuart of Dunleath', in 'Old Sir Douglas,' and in 'Lost and Saved.'

The heroines of the first two novels are blameless. Beatrice in 'Lost and Saved' is led astray through very innocence, and made to suffer far beyond any merited expiation. She is betrayed, in the full sense of the old-fashioned use of the word, by her lover, who is a very complete cad and a weakling. Eleanor in 'Stuart of Dunleath' is forced into a marriage in which there is, at first, passion on her husband's side but never tenderness, and though she is a faithful and would-be affectionate wife she is so cruelly treated that in the end she dies of her pain. Gertrude in 'Old Sir Douglas' makes a marriage of true love, and for a time knows almost perfect happiness; her husband is all that is good and kind, but even he is not proof against skilful treachery, and is led to believe lies about his wife. In each case the man is to blame; whether he is a cad like Traherne in 'Lost and Saved', a brute like Sir Stephen Penrhyn in 'Stuart of Dunleath' (the complete wicked baronet), or a gentleman in the fullest sense of the word like Sir Douglas; the last errs only through stupidity and imperfect trust in his wife, but he does err and Gertrude has to pay the price. The woman always pays; men make women suffer, and the world takes the man's side, giving the woman at best a contemptuous pity. That is the theme of most of Mrs Norton's fiction.

Her plots have plenty of stuff in them, even if it is melodramatic stuff. 'Lost and Saved' especially is

complicated by the fine old device of a will, disinheriting the hero if he marries without the consent of his guardians. So there is a false marriage which the world regards merely as a liaison. There are some noble characters and there are two female villains : real villains, one of quite horrifying wickedness, Mrs Myra Grey, the Indian wife of an English lawyer ; she has, it is indicated, poisoned her first husband, and she works a great deal of mischief, aided by the subsidiary villainess, her niece, Lady Nesdale. There is also a fantastically proud and heartless peeress, the Marchioness of Updown, who is somewhat incredible but has some comic value. Two of the noble characters make a happy marriage. Poor Beatrice suffers grievous things ; but in the end she finds happiness in a good marriage. The tangles are straightened out ; the cad-hero dies, poisoned. Mrs Norton has, in her wealth of invention, introduced a theme that might have made an excellent detective story. The evil Mrs Myra Grey prepares some poisoned wine for Maurice Llewellyn (one of the noble characters who has foiled one of her plots). He is suspicious, takes some of the wine for analysis, and, literally tries it on a dog that dies in agony. By mischance Traherne, the cad-hero, drinks some of the wine, and he too dies, a day or two later. He happens to be at sea, in his yacht ; a doctor, hurriedly summoned, diagnoses poison. Maurice knows about the wine ; but nothing is done, which infuriates the modern reader addicted to Agatha Christie and Margery Allingham. One longs to see Mrs Myra found out and hanged ; but the episode occurs at the end of the third volume and the lady is not for hanging.

Mrs Norton could create a villain, whether one respected by the world, like Sir Stephen Penrhyn, or a thorough-going outlaw like James Frere in ' Old Sir Douglas ', who is so accomplished a forger, assassin, smuggler, and thief that he compels our admiration ; and he dies horribly, which satisfies our moral sense. But for really odious evil she creates a woman. The truly hateful and terrifying character in ' Old Sir Douglas ' is Alice Ross, half-sister to the good, if bone-headed, Sir Douglas and the implacable enemy of his gentle wife Gertrude. Alice creeps and slinks about her evil ways, and is subtle as a serpent. She is discovered in the end and is cast out ; but not before she has brought Gertrude near to death.

In that novel and in 'Stuart of Dunleath' there is also a female character who is detestable while respectable : Lady Clochmaben in the one, Lady MacFarren in the other : caricatures, if you like, of the harshest type of Scotswoman, arrogant, stupid, unkind, yet not untrue to life, and both contribute to the heroine's suffering. One might wish Mrs Norton had written a comedy of social life, as relief from her near-tragedies ; for those women could be comic types if somewhat exaggerated.

In her own life Mrs Norton had much to bear from her sister-in-law, and she may have portrayed that lady in such characters. Her emotions are not always transmuted ; she is given to digressions, to passionate argument and defence which would have been better shown in action. Yet, for all their *longueurs*, their melodrama, their over-writing, her novels do move us with pity and terror ; and they do fascinate us as plots. We really care for what may happen to the heroine ; are moved to anger against her enemies ; even while (in a semi-subconscious way) we may cynically utter the gipsy's warning : ' Do not trust him, gentle maiden.'

Melodrama, like butter, should always be the best, and unlike the Carpenter we are not disposed to find it spread too thick. Both Mrs Norton and her contemporary, Lady Georgiana Fullerton (born 1812), have given us the best and thickest. Lady Georgiana too unites it with propaganda and instruction, and out of the whirl of events there is frequently heard what the Scots paraphrase calls ' Instruction's warning voice.' She too had a profound sympathy with her suffering fellow women, whether sinned against or sinning ; if they sin, as does Ellen Middleton in her first novel, it is by a dreadful accident, not by deliberate act, and the expiation is bitter. And women suffer through the men they love, through their weakness and selfishness or their sternness and self-righteousness. But Lady Georgiana writes more in compassion than in bitterness. The sorrows of her own life, the greatest and unquenchable being the death of her only son, were part of the sadness of humanity, not caused by malice or injustice, and were made an oblation by her faith and prayer. Suffering may kill the body, but it strengthens the soul, and even her most tragic heroines die at peace with God. Indeed that is probably the inner theme of all her stories : the *via*

*dolorosa* of a soul until it finds its rest in God. In this one might trace a resemblance between her work and the subtle, enchanting novels of the late Maurice Baring.

As regards her own history, she was born a Leveson-Gower, daughter of Lord Granville Leveson-Gower (later Earl Granville) and his wife, Lady Harriet, who was a daughter of the lovely Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire. Much of Lady Georgiana's childhood and youth were spent in Paris, where her father was our Ambassador, and her education was largely French. Her love and knowledge of France and French history were very deep; two of her books, her biography-in-a-novel of the Comtesse de Bonnevalle, and her 'Rose Leblanc' were written in French; and 'A Will and a Way' is a story of the French Revolution based on various family records.

In 1833 she married Alexander George Fullerton, an Irish officer in the Guards, who later transferred from the army to the diplomatic service and held more than one post abroad. They lived a good deal in Italy, which is reflected in her books. It was a happy marriage. Husband and wife were devout Anglicans, much influenced by the Oxford Movement, until, in 1843, Mr Fullerton was received into the Roman Communion. His wife followed him three years later. Thereafter she lived and worked and wrote with all the zeal of a convert. Her life was, indeed, almost that of a religious; she became a Franciscan Tertiary and observed an austere rule. With other devout ladies she helped to establish the English house of the Order of the Sacred Heart at Roehampton; and she founded a Community, that of the Poor Servants of the Mother of God, intended specially for poor girls who had a vocation but no dowry. These Poor Servants supported themselves by their work, chiefly at first by printing, besides giving much time and care and love to the poor.

Lady Georgiana's first novel, 'Ellen Middleton,' was written in her Anglican days, and shows the Tractarian teaching that influenced her then. She employs that favourite device of the Victorian novelist: the main story set within a framework; told or written as a memoir or confession. A good Anglican priest, Canon Lacey, sees Ellen, distraught and ill, at Evensong in the cathedral he serves; is later called in by her landlady; finds her in a state of spiritual despair and assures her of his power to

absolve her from her sins, by the authority committed to him, as a priest. This episode provoked Lord Brougham to pronounce the book 'rank popery.' Ellen gives him her own written account of her life ; and that is the main part of the novel.

She is haunted by a crime committed, partly in provoked anger but partly by accident, in her girlhood. No one knows or suspects it but a malignant old woman and one of the male actors in the story, Henry. There is between Henry and Ellen this knowledge, and on Henry's part violent love, on Ellen's a mixture of fear, dislike, and fascination ; but they are bound together and the strange ineluctable relationship is the compelling interest of their story. The 'hero,' Edward, whom Ellen marries, is a self-righteous type whom even his creator obviously dislikes, but whom Ellen adores. At first she thinks he knows of her crime, then she lives in terror of his discovering it. He has no suspicion of that, but he does suspect a guilty passion between Ellen and Henry. The latter, himself married (through another complication in the plot) to a gentle wife of almost saintly character and rule of life, persists in seeing Ellen and making scenes ; Edward, walking in upon one of those, believes the worst, and arranges for a formal and complete separation from Ellen.

There her manuscript ends ; Canon Lacey, after giving her spiritual solace, goes to find Edward, tells him the whole tragic tale, and wins his forgiveness for Ellen. He finds, also, Henry, now desperately ill in body and in agony of soul ; Henry dies, brought almost at the moment of death to some measure of faith and peace by his wife, Alice. Edward brings Ellen home, but only to die. Alice, in her widowhood, lives the semi-religious life practised at the period by many devout Anglican ladies, working in a hospital and among the poor.

It is not gay, this novel, but it has vitality and passion and a sincerity that not only make it supremely readable but almost obliterate, in the reader's judgment (at least for the time of reading), the melodrama, the absurdities of dialogue, the meanderings of plot. As a period-piece it has value for its picture of the new Anglican fervour, kindled by the Tractarians ; Alice would be at home in a novel by Charlotte Yonge.

Lady Georgiana's other novels are Roman Catholic in

background. In two of them, 'Grantley Manor' and 'Mrs Gerald's Niece' the melodrama is even thicker and better than in 'Ellen Middleton.' In 'Grantley Manor' there is a secret marriage between Edmund Neville, son of a bigoted Protestant father who has, in his will, made Edmund's inheritance of vast wealth dependent on his not marrying a Catholic. There are two heroines, Ginevra, the half-Italian, half-English and fervently Catholic bride of the secret marriage, and her half-sister Margaret, wholly English and Protestant. Edmund is a weak and despicable character—which does not prevent Ginevra's (and, for a time, Margaret's) being in love with him. In the end, after a near-tragedy of errors, Edmund admits his marriage; and is told by his sister that their father has added a codicil to his will; stating that if Edmund has (as has been rumoured) already married a Papist, he is nevertheless to inherit his fortune; because marriage is indissoluble and must be honoured. There is something of a happy ending; truly happy for Margaret, who marries a faithful lover; shadowed for Edmund and Ginevra, because the latter's suffering has brought her almost to death.

We hear the sequel to this tale in 'Mrs Gerald's Niece,' where Margaret and Edmund reappear as minor but influential characters; both now converts to Rome. Ginevra has died and Edmund has become a priest. Again there are two heroines, Annie an heiress, and Ita the adopted daughter of a lady who makes little appearance and fades out of the story presently. Ita has been brought up in the South of France; has been a waif; and is much inclined to Catholic pieties. The theme of the plot is, as the reader soon discovers with almost incredulous joy, the old and excellent one (popular A.D. as B.C.) of two babies rescued from a shipwreck and mixed up; and there is a scar on the shoulder of the wrong baby—who is Annie, Ita being the rightful heiress. Ita is an exquisite little person; Annie is most amiable and handsome in a massive way, but any person of breeding and discernment would feel doubtful of her aristocratic birth, because she has such big hands and feet. Mrs Gerald herself, who has received Annie as her niece in babyhood, suspects the truth, and hopes to marry Annie to her own son, Edgar. But Edgar falls in love with Ita and they marry. Edgar takes Holy Orders, and is a very devout High Anglican, as Ita is, for

a time ; but her childish memories and the influence of Margaret (from ' Grantley Manor '), whom she meets, and other forces compel her nearer and nearer Rome. After an illness, she and Edgar go to the South of France, and there they meet Father Edmund Neville, who in his own convert zeal tries to win them over. There are pages of argument and discussion between the two clerics, on lines familiar to every Anglican who has ever been involved in such discussion ; naturally the scales are weighted on Father Neville's side, and a wavering Anglican might, on reading these chapters, suffer from Roman fever. Ita is converted ; and after a period of stress Edgar follows her. Meanwhile, the whole complicated story of the wrong baby and the right baby has been disentangled. Annie finds her true mother, an Italian peasant. Poor Annie is not generously dealt with, for she loses both lover and fortune, though Ita has no mind to oust her and would have insisted on an arrangement. But, like earlier heroines, Annie has had too much to bear ; she goes into a decline and dies, at peace with everyone. Edgar takes up the life of a squire and layman on his wife's estate.

There is less propaganda in ' Ladybird,' for the main actors are already Roman Catholics, the heroine Gertrude's father being of the most rigid type, unsympathetic, harsh, and forbidding. Gertrude herself is not particularly devout, and the family chaplain, her uncle, is of a severe and dry piety. The Faith is presented without emotional appeal. But the dominating idea is the Catholic doctrine of sacrifice : not only the acceptance of suffering or the renunciation of unlawful love, but, it may be, renunciation of a happiness that the world would find entirely right and moral. Gertrude, who is a wilful and passionate girl, has married against her father's will ; her marriage is not entirely happy, her husband, Maurice, weak and unstable. Her true love, as she finds too late, is her husband's friend and benefactor D'Arberg. Maurice's death in a shipwreck, when he rescues some children, would seem to set the lovers free to marry. But Gertrude is aware of unfaithfulness in thought to her husband in his lifetime. Both she and D'Arberg realise this is as a moral and insuperable impediment ; they cannot build their happiness on the death of the man they had injured in thought. Gertrude returns to her father, is reconciled to him, and lives in

seclusion. One day in reading to him an account of the heroism and near-martyrdom of some Jesuit missionaries in China, she finds among their names that of D'Arberg.

This spiritual argument has been used in Maurice Baring's exquisite short novel, 'Passing By,' where the heroine, a devout Catholic, is bound to an unfaithful and unworthy husband and in love with a man who passionately desires her. The husband dies; but the wife has the same scruple, and refuses the lawful, apparently happy marriage now offered her. Instead she enters a convent, to the despair of her lover and the bewilderment of most of her friends.

Lady Georgiana's other novels are of less interest; though 'Rose Leblanc' is a charming and graceful tale. The books that are part fiction, part history or memoir, are excellent pictures of their period. 'Laurentia' is a tale, well told, of the Jesuit Missions in Japan, written for edification, as are some of her short stories. In later life she had scruples about her work; undoubtedly it showed forth Catholic doctrine and morals and it gained money for her charities. But she was a little afraid of the effects of those passionate scenes, that strong love interest. The least interesting of her books is undiluted Gadzookery or Wardour Street: 'A Stormy Life,' is the story, told by one of her ladies, of Margaret of Anjou, Queen of Henry VI.

But she is far more than a 'period' novelist; the interest of her novels is not merely that of quaintness or out-moded style. In both these half-forgotten Victorians, Mrs Norton and Lady Georgiana, there is the essential virtue of vitality. Their novels are readable. They knew the world, they knew human nature, they were not afraid to touch on 'guilt and misery'; and they could write with moving sincerity. Indeed, having read their books one may, for a time, find modern fiction anæmic.

They were both, in their utterly different ways, strong and vivid personalities. Mrs Norton lives in memory as herself a tragic heroine; Lady Georgiana as a near-saint who could create credible and not always unamiable sinners, and was aware of the horror of self-righteousness. They should not be ignored; nor should they be read in a condescending manner.

MARION LOCHHEAD.

# Art. 6.—A WOODMAN'S BIRDS.

THE title is deliberately vague. 'Some Woodland Birds' might require an attempt at definition and such problematical birds as the heron would have to be considered : most heronries are in tall trees in woods and the species might die out but for woods, yet only with hesitation could the heron be called a woodland bird. Again, there are various wild ducks : a century ago the old decoys were still working and very many of them were in woods. But a woodman, when considering 'his' birds, can be as eclectic as he chooses, for his work varies from the afforestation of bare pastures and high upland moors to the clear-felling of old forest in the valleys. I for my part shall exclude (save for passing mention) robins, which are woodland birds, and include woodlarks, which are not.

The varied work of forestry of course brings about varied changes in local bird populations. The several changes that follow in the first fifteen years after planting, as the trees grow from under 1 foot to over 20 feet, have been studied in detail by ornithologists, who have found that such a factor as the existence of song-posts of the right height (made by the trees at various ages) may be a chief reason for a species 'coming in' or 'going out.' For example, willow warblers, liking song-posts of five feet or a little over, are likely to come into a new plantation when it is about four years old ; a year or two later blackbirds will come in ; chaffinches and goldcrests may appear about eight years after planting. Chiff-chaffs, though so nearly related and closely similar to the willow warblers, seem to prefer heights above 30 or even above 40 feet, so they are likely to be late arrivals. Undergrowth is another factor : when undergrowth dies out, with the growing-up of the trees and the closing of the canopy, willow warblers and dunnocks are likely to disappear.

An instructive paper on 'Further changes in Bird Life caused by Afforestation,' by Dr and Mrs David Lack, appeared in the 'Journal of Animal Ecology'—November 1951 (No. 2, Vol. 20). Most of the investigation there described was made in Breckland—those Norfolk/Suffolk heaths whose transformation into a forest has been criticised by amateur naturalists and 'country-lovers.' The bird population has of course changed greatly in the last

quarter-century : what used to be the territory of skylarks, meadow pipits, whinchats, and stonechats is now the home of chaffinches, coal tits, wrens, and goldcrests. Dr Lack goes into some detail, showing (for example) the differences between the bird population of Scots and Corsican pine plantations and comparing them with spruce and Douglas fir plantations in other parts of the country. Wherever observations have been made the goldcrest and the coal tit were the commonest winter birds in conifer plantations 17-26 years old, and there are generally more birds in Scots pine and spruce plantations than in Corsican and Douglas fir. Numbers are not high : the breeding population in conifer forests in that pole stage of 17-26 years is likely to be between 175 and 225 birds per 100 acres (say two adults an acre), but then other observers have found that well-managed woodland seldom carries more than five adult birds per acre. Counts in the Breckland plantations have revealed the most interesting point of all : the pine plantations of this East Anglian forest now harbour more than three times as many breeding birds as the open heathland had done 30 years ago. So much for the often-repeated statement that modern forestry is always distasteful to birds.

(I have not mentioned that strange and fascinating species the crossbill, because it had begun to nest regularly in pine woods on the Norfolk/Suffolk border before 1920—and modern afforestation. But the establishment of more than 35,000 acres of new plantations, with pine trees predominating, must have been to the advantage of the exotic-looking crossbill, which is in this country primarily a bird of the Scots pine, though it will also feed on larch cones and on the Continent is fond of spruce. The powerful crossed mandibles are specially adapted to the work of cutting cones, so that the bird can obtain the seeds within. If crossbill numbers were comparable with starling numbers, the foresters' pride in the species might change to quite another feeling ! Winter-visitor crossbills from the Continent are to be seen in many parts of England : incursions are irregular, but not at all rare.)

It is true that a mixed semi-natural woodland, composed mainly of deciduous trees of varied ages, so that the canopy is freely broken and there is plenty of underwood, will contain more birds than any closely planted modern forest.

That is the typical estate woodland of southern England as maintained by a pheasant-shooting, fox-hunting squirearchy in the past : it carries about one-quarter to one-fifth of a fair crop of timber, but has wood anemones, primroses, bluebells, and butterfly orchids ; in its bushes the nightingales rear their young ; among the branches of the oaks you may see the firetail or redstart ; in some favoured places the daintiest of all the falcons, the hobby, will nest and stoop for dragonflies—or for the skylarks in the cornfields round the wood. But a forester or woodman is shocked by the waste of good land : he may be fond of birds but his first interest is timber, and he will immediately protest that such woods as these are poorly stocked . . . why isn't the land carrying a proper crop ?

When woodland is well-stocked (and this applies where the main trees are oak or beech as well as for conifer plantations) most of the bird population will prefer the more open places such as any glades or the margins of rides or plots which were clear-felled five years ago. At the same time these places have their dangers, and if the population increases so that some birds are forced to spend much of their time in the open, or to nest in less desirable spots (because of the competition or pressure on the more desirable) then the casualties will increase. One day a sparrowhawk will catch the bird away from cover, or a jay will find the ill-sited nest.

There are of course many species which are rightly ranked as woodland species without being exclusively woodland : that is, they will spend much of their time outside woods and even live and nest entirely outside woods. People sometimes forget that this island was formerly mainly forest or woodland, and that many birds which have adapted themselves to life in the more open conditions of field and garden are primarily sylvan species. The most obvious example is the chaffinch, thought to be the most numerous of any species in Britain. (That judgment of the scientific ornithologists, based on counts, nearly always surprises the man in the street.) But there are also more interesting species, such as the hawfinch and the bullfinch. The hawfinch has tended to increase in the last twenty-five years and is something of a nuisance in those areas where it lives in old woodland and makes early-morning forays into gardens—to feast on green peas or

cherries. The hawfinch is said to be specially fond of the seeds of the hornbeam, preferring them even to those of the hawthorn, but I have not lived in any region where the hornbeam is a common tree—as it is in parts of Essex, Hertfordshire, and Kent. The bullfinch can be a major pest because of its attacks on fruit buds, yet much is forgiven for the beauty of the cock birds: the memory of one particular sight of bullfinches in snow in a Pembrokeshire garden remains with me from some fifteen winters ago.

Another, though very different, bird of old-fashioned open woodland, of orchards and hedgerows is the beneficent long-tailed or bottle-tit—a graceful fairy adorned with many pink feathers, a colour rare in British birds. The bottle-tit is a more vagrant, less static species than the other tits (which are not, in fact, such near relations as the English names suggest) and one usually sees it 'passing through' in family parties, the members of which seem always to be whispering softly to one another.

The woodlark's name might seem to entitle it to a place in any woodman's review of 'his' birds but that name might really have been invented deliberately to mislead novices, for the woodlark (as I have already noted) is not really a bird of the woods. In its Latin label the specific adjective is not *sylvatica* but *arborea*, and, even then, it does not normally nest or feed in trees or bushes, but on the ground—like its very near relation the skylark. However, the woodlark does perch on bushes and trees and it does prefer a more wooded country to those great expanses of cornfields or open downs which are the first choice of the skylark. The woodlark is sure of a place in almost any list of Britain's six best song birds: because of the character of the song and the fact that it may often be heard at night, the woodlark is often mistaken for the nightingale.

Three warblers nearly related to the much-discussed nightingale must have at least a passing mention. First there is the blackcap, another certainty for a place among the six best singers. Formerly thought to be only a summer resident, the blackcap is now known sometimes to winter in the south-western peninsula. The blackcap is fond of tall trees and shows no dislike of conifers. Second is the garden warbler, another misleadingly named bird (though in a contrary direction to the woodlark), for it is essentially a woodland and not a garden species. A fine

singer, it is also quite tolerant of conifers. Third is the most emphatically sylvan of the family, the wood-warbler, which specially likes old beech woods. But it is a relatively poor singer and has been ranked by one amateur of bird music as 'a minor melodist.' Experiments indicate that the wood-warbler's song is innate. I imagine that the woodlark's song is (like the skylark's) learnt by the young woodlarks listening to the older birds.

Since confusing nomenclature has been mentioned, the marsh and willow tits cannot be overlooked. The marsh tit is the more woodland species and the willow tit the more water-loving. But I confess to being not quite certain of knowing one from the other, though both are resident in old deciduous woodlands. Both have the unfortunate habit of distributing the seeds of honeysuckle, which is an exceedingly grievous nuisance in young plantations.

Most of the small birds just mentioned are favourites both with ornithologists and birdlovers, but another much larger and entirely different species has I think been undervalued by people who are interested in birds as birds.\* I am thinking of black game or black grouse. Being game, they are perhaps felt to be tainted with sporting and culinary associations which make their status 'unnatural.' In fact, however, the black grouse is one of the most 'natural' of all birds: the species seems to be able to live only in wild territory—in thinly-populated regions where poor pasture meets the forest or the forest meets heathland or moor. Though blackgame (the term of course includes black cock and grey hen) survived in Surrey and the New Forest within the memory of living man, it is now extinct in southern England save in West Somerset and Devon, and it appears to be on the decline in Wales, northern England, and Scotland. The reason for the changing status of blackgame is not any special shyness of man (I have watched the birds at very close quarters on Exmoor and one observer has seen them within a mile of Minehead), but rather that the species belongs to particular kinds of wilderness which are becoming scarcer as the human population increases and intrudes (by car) and land is more intensively cultivated or planted with trees.

---

\* This suggestion ought perhaps to be qualified by a reference to Dr Lack's observations in 'British Birds,' vol. xxxii, pp. 290-303, and E. O. Höhn's paper in 'The British Journal of Animal Behaviour,' vol. 1, No. 2.

Blackgame are polygamous, yet the much more handsome cocks often outnumber the hens. Their voices are warm and friendly, free of the stridency and carrying power of the voices of red grouse, partridge, and pheasant. Their flight always looks remarkably purposeful and powerful—but that may be partly because they generally prefer to fly downhill! Unlike red grouse, blackgame commonly perch in trees and they also have a special weakness for picking out the buds of the leading shoots and branches of any newly planted conifers. Though they are not so extremely destructive as their cousins, the capercaillie (the largest of all the grouse family in the world and a true forest species, being sometimes called 'the cock of the woods'), they are quite destructive enough, and woodmen and foresters, when planting new ground, sometimes have to treat the birds as pests. It is to be hoped, however, that as the new forests become safely established, blackgame may be allowed to survive: the observation that 'It's a poor grouse moor that cannot afford to keep a golden eagle' might be extended to 'It's a poor forest that cannot afford to keep a few blackgame.'

A woodman is bound to observe the six species which are, perhaps, the most indisputably sylvan and arboreal of all British birds—the goldcrest, the tree-creeper, the nut-hatch, and the three woodpeckers. All these birds are easy to watch and they have in fact been studied closely and in great detail within the present century, so one cannot expect to say anything new. Yet two or three points are worthy of remark. In some localities the goldcrest has shown a special liking for the Douglas fir, both as feeding haunt and for nesting, and the tree-creeper has similarly found that the wellingtonia (*Sequoia gigantea*) is specially congenial to it, because the soft, deeply fissured bark provides ideal roosting and nesting places. Now, these are noteworthy details because many of the people who dislike foreign conifers have backed their statements that British birds avoid modern forests with allegations that the alien or foreign trees are in themselves distasteful to the birds. But, quite apart from the special preferences of goldcrests and tree-creepers, the allegations are entirely false. Some years ago Mr J. M. D. Mackenzie (who has done a great deal of research into the problems of forest ornithology) reported that in his surveys far more birds' nests were found in

Sitka spruce than in any other tree ; that Norway spruce came second on the list ; roughly equal and third was a group of four species—Douglas fir, thuya, and the Lawson's and Monterey cypresses. All these trees are foreign, and it is only within the last fifty years that any (save Norway spruce) has been planted on a large scale in Britain. Compared with those half-dozen evergreen conifers our indigenous broad-leaved trees are rather bare and open, and they presumably offer too little protection against both weather and predatory enemies. (Apropos of weather, it should perhaps be noted that the tree-creeper, goldcrest, and green woodpecker are among the most susceptible of all British birds to destruction by any severe spell in the winter : hard winters such as 1916-17 and 1946-47 killed something like 75 per cent of our tree-creepers and goldcrests. Long-tailed or bottle-tits are also extremely vulnerable.

The two spotted woodpeckers bring one word automatically to mind : drumming. When I first became a woodman I still belonged to the minority who think that the drumming is vocal, but observation in the woods and the published reasoning of ornithologists led me to desert to the other side—to accept that the drumming sound was indeed produced mechanically, by the tapping (at speeds varying from 7 to 15 per second) of the beak on wood. So well known a field naturalist as the late Mr Eric Parker still held the vocal theory long after others had been converted, but within the last twenty years the accumulating arguments on the other side have become increasingly difficult to withstand and now the standard authority, Witherby's 'Handbook of British Birds,' shows undisguised contempt for the view that a woodpecker drums with its larynx rather than its beak.

The large, familiar, and handsome green woodpecker is remarkable not only for its exceedingly gay colours and its laughter but also for the richness and variety of its names : it is of course the yaffle and the rainbird (though there is apparently no foundation for the country idea that the laughter is an omen of rain), and at the same time it is the heigh-ho and the stockeagle. In the Middle Ages it was the popinjay. The green woodpecker is at home on lawns and it has even been known to rob strawberry beds. It is specially fond of ants' nests : hence those occasional

tragedies in rabbit snares, which seemed to provide such an incongruous end to any woodpecker's life. In Britain the green woodpecker is the chief enemy of the large wood ant, who is among the forester's best insect friends—because wood ants destroy harmful caterpillars. Yet the bird has not been subject to any persecution for this reason, though beekeepers have occasionally reached for a gun because of attacks on beehives. Probably all three woodpeckers do far more good than harm, but this is a point about which Continental foresters have wavered from time to time: at one period the woodpeckers have been proscribed, at another they have been protected. I used myself to believe that woodpeckers never attacked sound trees, but the Post Office's experience in recent years should make anyone cautious. (Perfectly sound telegraph poles have been badly damaged.)

On the Continent, and as near to us as Holland, there is also a fourth woodpecker—the great black woodpecker. Lord Lilford released a few adult birds of this species in England, but they did not prosper or multiply. Just possibly the black woodpecker could be established here, if we wanted it, by the transplanting of eggs—the putting of eggs from the Continent into the nests of green woodpeckers. After all this talk of woodpeckers I must confess to not knowing from which species Beethoven derived his phrase, 'Fate knocking at the door,' which became so familiar as the V sign during the Second World War.

There is no need to say anything of the beauty and interest which birds add to life in the woods: in no other country in the world and at no other time in history have birds been so widely and highly appreciated as in the United Kingdom in this present year. Indeed, it might be more useful to murmur that birds can become tedious. Both the song and the alarm notes of the chaffinch, for example, grow wearisome with repetition: the New Forest nickname, *chinker*, is apt. The strident notes of the little saw-sharpener, the great or tom tit, do not gratify the ear. And when the chiffchaff falls silent after having repeated its dissyllables continuously and without noticeable variation for more than fourteen weeks, I am not sorry. As for the greenfinch—fain would I change that 'tswee.' Even the cuckoo, which eats the hairy caterpillars disliked by other birds, is sometimes too noisy and one remembers Milton's

unkind reference to the 'rude bird of hate.' But no true bird-lover will sympathise with such heretical impatience.

About the general utility of birds in woods there is some difference of opinion. According to one school of thought birds (and this means especially insect-eating birds) are immensely useful: they are the resident police of the woods and it is because of their actions that various criminals make little headway. Even when the offenders do triumph and there is, for example, an epidemic of Tortrix caterpillars defoliating the oaks, a keen bird man will tell you that the trouble has probably been caused by sheep: the sheep have come into the woods and killed or half-killed the bushes which formed the nesting sites of the insectivorous birds. He will recall how some caterpillar plagues have been cleared by the arrival of starlings; how it has been computed that a single pair of great tits will, during the twenty days when they are rearing young, devour as many as 8,000 insects—and he may add that chaffinches are almost as good, since they, in common with many other seed-eaters, prey heavily on insects at nesting time. Your enthusiast will produce records of a pine sawfly outbreak being suppressed by gulls, and of larch sawflies being wiped out by rooks, jackdaws, and starlings. 'Observe,' he will say, 'even when trouble passes out of the control of the resident police of the woods, and the militia has to come in to restore order, that militia is composed of birds.' The Forestry Commission has been impressed by this line of argument, and they achieved some success with a famous experiment in the Forest of Dean, where nesting-boxes were set up to encourage pied flycatchers.

Another school of thought holds that birds probably make little difference: insect numbers are so vast compared with the birds' capacity to consume, that the birds are insignificant. A third school (mainly Continental) has suggested that the presence of many birds in a forest is a symptom of ill health: there must be many insects there (and probably harmful insects) or there would not be birds! But that unkind line of reasoning should perhaps be paired with the special *mystique* surrounding the jay in some Continental forests. The jay is the acorn-planter: the acorns which it plants always grow into good oaks, and the jay can make good oaks grow (for example, on the

poorest ground surrounded by pine plantations) where man-planted oaks would certainly fail. The jay understands the nature of things and it plants acorns deliberately, so that its descendants may have acorns!

After glancing at all these extravagances, scientific or superstitious, anyone might be forgiven for asking, What is the truth? But it is an impossible question: a man might, for example, ask how many acorns a jay would have to plant (and in 'right' places) in order to excuse its rapacity in having swallowed three broods of insect-eating birds. Or how many harmful insects must a pheasant eat to counterbalance its greed when devouring seeds which might have grown into trees?

However, without pretending to the rôle of a Solomon in biological problems, one may suggest that, in the forests and woodlands of the United Kingdom, most birds are on balance more useful than harmful; that some (the predominantly insectivorous species) do more good than others; and that capercaillie, black game, woodpigeons, and possibly starlings are the only birds whose misdeeds commonly outweigh the benefits which they confer upon our woods. Of pigeons it may be said that their consumption of beech mast is a very serious adverse factor in the natural regeneration of beech woods.

At this last moment comes the thought that nothing has been said of the sparrowhawk or of those useful and mainly sylvan birds, the tawny owl (which utters the beautiful hoooo-ooo-oo and might better be called the brown or wood owl) and the rarer long-eared owl which specially loves the conifers and ought to be pleased with modern forestry! The sparrowhawk must perhaps rank with the doubtful characters because it preys so much on useful small birds. But owls are mainly beneficent birds almost anywhere, and since the two species named feed largely on rodents (rats, mice, and voles) which attack trees and tree seeds, they are emphatically friends of the forester. The feeding habits of the tawny owl are the subject of a long-term and minutely scientific study, still in progress, by H. N. Southern of the Bureau of Animal Population at Oxford. An important paper by this authority on 'Tawny Owls and their Prey' appeared in 'Ibis,' vol. 96.

J. D. U. WARD.

## Art. 7.—BYRON AND THE STAGE.

'It is not an acting play.'

THE Clarendon selections from Byron's writing now set for the G.C.E. Advanced Level Literature Paper II by London University have no extracts from the plays, though the editor has found snippets from the narratives easy enough to cut ; and the little anthology of a year or so ago, 'Byron For Today,' edited by Roy Fuller, also had nothing from the plays, though in its case the narratives too were omitted. Now, why is this ? Perhaps an anthology has to have some single theme ; and if you are selecting from the work of so complex and versatile a writer as Byron, perhaps a single and ruthless theme is all too easy to choose. Lyricist, narrative poet, satirist ; egocentricity, sex, liberty ; the sea ; Greece ; Byron and other poets ; Byron's loneliness ; Byron and Nature ; Byron and Byronism—a dozen and more anthologies are possible. Or again, since it is the correct view of Byron—his complexity and his versatility—that he was moving all the time towards 'Don Juan' (which he would still be writing to-day if he were alive), perhaps if anything must be left out of a short survey of the 'development,' it is the plays. They cannot be left out of any complete analysis, of course : without drama first, there can be no novel ; without the plays first out of his system, there could not have come from Byron the full blossoming of the strange novel of 'Don Juan.' Or again—and let us hope that this is the real reason—selection from a play is difficult and ought to be impossible ; certainly extracts from plays constructed on the plan which Byron thought right, cannot easily be made.

Whatever the reason, however, the fact is that, with the lonely exception of Mr Wilson Knight, everyone is silent about Byron's plays. They are just among his 'other' works ; why should we bother with them when we have 'Beppo' and 'Don Juan' ?

It was not always so. In the local Windsor paper, 'The Windsor and Eton Express and General Advertiser,' which came out for the first time on Aug. 1, 1812, Byron was to enjoy(?) a sustained prominence, both as man and as writer, unparalleled in the history of journalism, national or provincial ; and criticisms of his plays had much of the spotlight throughout the progress from the enthusiastic ad-

miration which greeted 'Hebrew Melodies' and most of 'Childe Harold' to the enthusiastic abuse which greeted 'The Vision of Judgment' and 'Don Juan.' Indeed, his plays were allotted an amount of critical space that we must now consider disproportionate to their value in the whole Byron canon, however highly we may rate them.

To understand why they did receive so much attention we have to know more than the mere fact of Byron's tremendous notoriety in his own day: we have to study the whole phenomenon of the theatre and its drama at that time. For our present purpose, however, it will be enough to realise that these were hyperbolical days on the stage no less than everywhere else. They were the days of Kean's performance as Sir Giles Overreach; of Kemble, G. F. Cooke, Munden, and Mr Betty; days when production and acting reached heights or depths of extravagance ('the rant of the present day') that we would laugh out of court; days when audiences often took matters into their own hands; days, in short, when the theatre and the drama were no less 'the rage' (in every sense of the word) than the doings of 'the noble author' himself. Windsor had its own theatre, to which George III and the Royal Family were frequent visitors and where Kean, Mr Betty, and most of the other famous actors performed. 'With the plebeians in the pit,' Charles Knight wrote in his autobiography, 'Passages of a Working Life,' 'the Royal Family might have shaken hands; and when they left, there was always a scramble for their satin bills, which would be afterwards duly framed and glazed as spoils of peace. As the King laughed and cried, "Bravo, Quick!" or "Bravo, Suett!"—for he had rejoiced in their well-known mirth-provoking faces many a time before,—the pit and gallery clapped and roared in loyal sympathy.'

These were also days when the contemporary popular drama was perhaps at its lowest point, and when the theatre was in the hands of unscrupulous, or at the best eccentric and absurd, men. What Addison had found to criticise in the stage of his day was now a century worse. The English public theatre had always mixed low comedy and high tragedy, cock-fighting and 'Macbeth,' but now, in Windsor, Kean in 'Othello' was mixed with Mr Kendell flying 'from the gallery to the stage by an apparatus upon a new and improved principle' and dancing 'a clog

hornpipe (blind-folded) over twelve eggs.' Things had gone pretty far. Worse still, producers were doing what they pleased with plays, cutting, adding, and rewriting mercilessly for spectacle and sensation's sakes. And the adapter (who is always with us) was compensating for his own lack of original genius by concocting popular stage-successes out of other men's stories and poems. 'The Bride of Abydos' was so honoured early in 1818.

The Windsor paper was alert to all this, and in 1813 welcomed Coleridge's 'Remorse' as a serious contribution to drama in contrast with what was generally going on: 'This play is entitled to peculiar consideration, as it forms a solitary exception to the degraded state of the modern stage. Mr Coleridge is the only man of real poetical talent who has condescended to submit his productions to that taste which has been corrupted by the Reynolds, and Dibdins, and Dimonds of the day.' Such a statement helps us to understand not only Byron's uncompromising attitude to the theatre, but also the ambivalence of, say, Shelley, who very much wanted 'The Cenci' to be produced with Miss O'Neil as Beatrice, and yet, according at least to Peacock, 'had a prejudice against theatres which I took some pains to overcome.' Mary Shelley, too, said in her note to 'The Cenci' that he 'was not a playgoer, being of such fastidious taste that he was easily disgusted by the bad filling-up of the inferior parts.' It is no wonder that Byron, with his experiences on the Drury Lane Committee—and being out of England at that—should have made the categorical announcement that his plays were not for the stage.

He was himself a playgoer and had shown great interest in the theatre (his Prize Address at the opening of Drury Lane Theatre is quoted in full in the Windsor paper for Oct. 17, 1812—though of course the editor did not know what we know about that). But his short service on the Committee was, for all its attractions, an enervating business and left a bad taste in his mind, what with finance, auditorium-lighting, the personal squabbles of the members ('we were but few, but never agreed'), 'a devil of a row among our ballerinas', difficulties of casting ('The Truth is, we are not amply furnished with tragic women'), and, worst of all, the selection of plays. Of the five hundred which, in 'Detached Thoughts,' Byron said were 'upon the

shelves' when he joined the Committee, there was not 'one which could be conscientiously tolerated.' Miss Emma Somebody's 'The Bandit of Bohemia' on the Drury Lane shelves, and 'Wild Oats, or the Strolling Gentleman' and 'How to Die for Love' at the Theatre Royal, Windsor—there were 'Coriolanus' and 'Timon of Athens,' but there was all that as well, and Byron was soon glad to be far away from it. When he came to write his own plays, what else could he do but write them in a way that precluded their performance on such a stage as he well knew existed in England? For, despite superficial statements to the contrary by people who ought to know better, Byron was a serious and proud artist.

I do not mean to imply, however, that the only reason why he wrote his plays as he did was to make them unsuitable for presentation in the contemporary theatre: his interest in the unities and his belief that he was creating a new drama, or recreating the old (=Greek) and true, were based on scrupulous æsthetic principles:

'He (Barry Cornwall) will do a world's wonder if he produce a great tragedy. I am, however, persuaded, that this is not to be done by following the old dramatists,—who are full of gross faults, pardoned only by the beauty of their language,—but by writing naturally and regularly, and producing regular tragedies, like the Greeks; but not in imitation,—merely the outline of their conduct, adapted to our own times and circumstances, and of course no chorus.'

So his intimate knowledge of the theatre and drama of his own day, and his own literary preferences, combined in the writing of plays which were constructed on unfashionable, 'regular' lines and, therefore, were not fitted for production at Drury Lane or anywhere else. They were for 'the solitary reader only.' From the contemporary cock-fighting of the theatre as he knew it Byron recoiled like a Puritan of two centuries earlier; both as man and as writer he was, like Malvolio, 'a kind of puritan,' and to the masters of the theatre he was, in effect, saying: 'Is there no respect of place, persons, nor time, in you?'

But he forgot that he was Byron, a name with unequalled 'box-office appeal,' and he lived before our modern conception of copyright. Fortunately for us, too, the Windsor paper was being edited by Charles Knight, himself a keen theatre-goer and serious student of drama—the man,

indeed, who later was to edit the huge 'Pictorial Shakspeare,' helped and encouraged by, among others, Henry Nelson Coleridge, Leigh Hunt, Thomas Hood, and Allan Cunningham. So we can see, in the pages of the Windsor paper, something of what was happening to and being thought of by Byron's plays in his own day, and something of his contemporary reputation.

Of the eight plays, 'Marino Faliero,' 'Sardanapalus,' 'The Two Foscari,' 'Cain,' and 'Werner' are discussed at length.

'Marino Faliero' is dismissed outright as 'below the standard of tragedy-writing of the present day' (meaning surely nothing below the standard of 'Remorse'?) and 'is too artificial for the stage.' How wise the writer was being. Byron himself had already told Murray in a letter, 'it is not an acting play'.

'It is not akin to Manfred,' the review continues, 'in sublimity of conception or force of expression; its sentiments are not gifted with originality, nor its diction with that brilliancy which presents them at once to our convictions and our admiration. The Doge of Venice is, in fact, an experiment in a new species of composition; and, great as is the genius of the author, he cannot preserve an equal flight through every region of literature. We apprehend that, in the delineation of real life and manners, he will appear but the tiny shadow of that giant energy and grandeur of intellect with which he awes and astonishes, when traversing the world of gloomy imaginations and morbid sensibilities; for his system is not to rule our sympathies by simple touches of nature so much as by the aggravations of humanity, which strike upon our associations.'

At least the writer recognised 'an experiment in a new species of composition.' But both he and Byron had overlooked 'mountebank' Elliston.

That gentleman set to work and presented the play at Drury Lane in the customary mutilated form:

'Lord Byron's Tragedy, the Doge of Venice, was acted on Wednesday evening, to the no small surprise of that part of the public, at least, who had read his Lordship's preface to the publication, wherein he states distinctly that he never wrote, and never will write, with the design of having his pieces represented on the stage. Now in the face of this unequivocal protest, what apology can the management of Drury Lane theatre offer for dragging on the stage, after five days prepara-

tion, not only a drama professedly not constructed with a view to representation, but a drama mutilated and disfigured by God knows what hand, to bring it within the acting time ?'

Luckily for Byron, however, there was some attempt at copyright. Indeed, a sort of cold war was being waged throughout the period against piratical publishers and producers, though the pirates usually managed to keep in business. The Lord Chancellor forbade the repetition of the play 'till it can be legally determined whether the printing of a play gives the Theatre a partnership interest in its profits, with the further right of mutilating it as they please'; and the result was that Mr Elliston was allowed to carry on—unluckily for Byron. Intimations that something of the sort was to happen had already reached Byron in Italy, but when he heard of the play's failure he wrote to Murray: 'It would be nonsense to say that this has not vexed me a good deal, but I am not dejected, and I shall not take the usual resource of blaming the public (which was in the right), or my friends for not preventing—what they could not help, nor I neither—a forced representation by a speculating manager.' His magnanimity extended to promising to cancel his agreement with Murray if 'the folly of Elliston checks the sales.'

The Windsor paper shared Byron's anger, though it felt that, in any case, enough had been revealed of Byron's own play to prove it 'dull and uninteresting.'

The volume containing 'Sardanapalus,' 'The Two Foscari,' and 'Cain' was given a mixed reception:

'A volume of plays published, as the author tells us, "without the remotest view of the stage," would be a hazardous speculation in any author but Lord Byron. His Lordship, however, is in more senses than one a privileged man, and if his claim of privilege is always to produce to us as much pleasure as we have enjoyed from the perusal of the work before us ('Sardanapalus') long may he retain his immunities.

'Nevertheless, our readers must not expect unalloyed gratification from these Dramas. The poets of the present day are so anxious to present the effusions of their muse to the public, that they seldom stay to examine into the real inspiration of all which they commit to paper. If the true end of poetry were astonishment, then indeed might this work claim pre-eminence, for a more complete mixture of good and bad we never happened to encounter in the course of our lives.'

In his preface Byron had 'expressed himself with a pithy and dignified contempt' on the production of 'Marino Faliero,' but, the paper goes on, he need not worry that anyone will produce either 'Sardanapalus' or 'The Two Foscari.' The former might tempt them—'they may contrive to make a glorious pageant of the battle and the burning'—but probably not; and as for the latter, it is

'perfectly inaccessible. We can imagine the Sovereign of the Green-room pursing up his brows as he toils through its long declamations and its wire-drawn dialogues; he would infallibly sign its death-warrant in the usual formula—"want of interest—no stage effect—no acting." Your manufacturers of tragedies composed of "drum and trumpet, blunderbuss and thunder," have a profound contempt of the "Greek model."'

It is sometimes hard to tell on whose side the writer was, Byron's or Elliston's.

'Cain,' however, really upset him:

'It is quite unnecessary for his Lordship to inform us that he has not read Milton since he was twenty, lest some coincidence might be imputed to him. Though the *Paradise Lost* be that book of which of all others we habitually taste as of an undefiled well, we had not a thought of it while we were bound to this worthless *Mystery*. Lord Byron must occasionally write with great power;—but it requires a pure heart to make a true poet. It is an unnatural, and therefore a useless labour, to dip the gross creations of scepticism and profligacy into the colours of imagination;—they have the earth stains upon them, which not even the hand of genius can remove.'

The review of 'Werner' opened enthusiastically: 'We have read the *Tragedy* before us with uncommon pleasure. A great deal of this sensation can be ascribed to the beauty of the production itself: to its knowledge of the human heart, its freedom, its vigour, its poetry.' But Byron had cheated:

'The tragedy of *Werner* is an exception to that class of productions with which Lord Byron has so unfortunately identified his genius. It does not outrage us by cold-blooded metaphysical speculations, which set us thinking for the purpose of filling us with fearful and debasing notions of the universal Creator. It does not freeze up the current of genial and kindly sentiments, by confounding the distinctions of virtue and vice, teaching us to look suspiciously and blighting upon every

principle that men agree to admire and reverence. It does not play the pander to the corruptions of the heart, as well as of the understanding, by degrading love into the gratification of a brute passion, and clothing voluptuous images with those thin draperies, which are far more seductive than licentiousness in its more open form.'

Byron had ended his preface to 'Werner': 'The whole is neither intended, nor in any shape adapted, for the stage.' The writer cynically observed that 'the warning will be very like a temptation.'

And that was that, Byron had written the drama out of himself and himself out of drama, and 'Don Juan' had already come and would go on for ever. The pirates had had their little day; the critic in the provinces, as in the metropolis, had said his fill; the unities had been championed and the new kind of play had been put on permanent exhibition in the collected works. Whether or not we, who have also been offered a new drama for our own day—which has, however, been deliberately written for stage-production—will ever see any of Byron's plays performed is, to say the least, unlikely. It is a pity. 'Samson Agonistes' (dare we mention Milton?) was never to be acted either, so much did its writer loathe the drama and theatre of his time; but we have seen it produced somewhat as it ought to be. We still have our daft theatre, of course; but we are very serious about drama; we have experimental and 'little' theatres; we have television, a medium for drama hardly yet explored, and perhaps the very 'theatre of the mind.' Maybe the time is now ripe for us to see whether Byron's plays are, after all, any form of public theatre. If they are not, then Byron was right for all ages and not just for his own. But if they are, and we can establish what the form is, we may 'discover' a Byron we have not yet properly known. He himself doubted whether such a creature existed; and whether it does or not, and whether his plays are produced or not, he—long after the rows among the ballerinas, long after Miss Emma Somebody and Mr Elliston—will not, I fancy, turn in his tomb.

NOEL SCOTT.

# Art. 8.—THE WEB OF LIFE.

THE word 'community' as applied to animals could convey one of several meanings. A casual assemblage of insects on a clump of michaelmas daisies is a community of sorts. So, with more accuracy perhaps, is a herd of deer, a shoal of herrings, or a rookery in a grove of elms. Yet again, a hive of bees or a nest of wood-ants, each with its elaborate social organisation, is very much an animal community. All these uses of the word are in varying degrees acceptable. Nevertheless ecology, which is the science of living things in relation to their surroundings and to one another, and, like all sciences, relies on accurately defined terms, uses it in a sense different from any of these. To the ecologist, who can himself be defined as a scientific naturalist, one essential thing about a community of animals is diversity. It never consists of one kind of animal, always of several kinds, and often of a very large number. The other essential reference is to place, to the particular habitat of which the animals in question are the characteristic denizens. Obviously there is an enormous variation from one habitat to another, and a corresponding variation in the animal communities characteristic of them. A very wide variation is acknowledged also in the size of habitats. In the widest sense of all the entire surface of the earth is a habitat, and corresponding to it the whole known animal population of the planet, including man himself, is a community in the sense used by the ecologist.

Within this widest of all limits the range of habitats is enormous. Geographers divide the surface of the earth into major natural regions depending on climate, and by way of climate on vegetation. Each of these major natural regions is also a major habitat and each has its characteristic animal community. Thus we find the communities inhabiting the tropical rain-forest, the savanna grasslands, the coniferous forest of the temperate zone, the desert, and the Arctic tundra. All these are habitats of very wide extent, too wide to be homogeneous as to climate and vegetation, in spite of being ruled by conditions, broadly speaking similar. This must mean that each is capable of subdivision, and that each subdivision, itself capable of being subdivided, will have a community of animals attached to it. Every one of these communities provides raw material

for the ecologist. A region of coniferous forest, for example, of continental extent can be divided in the first place into land and water, so that rivers, lakes, and marshes on the one hand, will be sharply distinguished, so far as their animal inhabitants are concerned, from any of the habitats provided by dry land within the same forest region. So too will an animal community inhabiting a marsh differ from that inhabiting a lake. These are two distinct habitats, and there will be a very large number of others: a clearing in the forest, whether natural or artificial; the shallows of a lake as distinct from the central depths; the floor of the forest; the undergrowth it supports; a stand of pines or spruces; a single tree; the trunk as distinct from the branches; even a hollow in a decayed tree temporarily filled with rain-water. All these provide habitats for animal communities.

Two important points establish themselves as a result of examining any of these. First, at least as regards all except the largest and most widely separated habitats, they are not exclusive of one another in respect of their inhabitants. We shall not find, that is to say, that one habitat supports a population of various kinds of animal, while an adjoining one supports a population of different kinds. There is a large measure of overlap. Species common in one may well be common in another. Spiders, for instance, can be found in enormous numbers in a damp meadow, and the same will be true of a dry heath, though the spiders are not likely to be of the same kinds in both cases. Many species of insect too will be common to both. Thus, while there are similarities, there will also be sufficient variations, both of number and of kind, for the two communities to be distinguished from one another.

The second point emerging is basic to the whole subject. This is that all the members of any one community are linked together in an elaborate web of circumstance, a network of mutual dependence, wonderfully and beautifully complex. It is not the extent of the habitat that determines the complexity, but its richness as regards food. Over a wide stretch of equatorial forest, for instance, the strands of the web will be exceedingly numerous, but they could hardly be more so than those concerned with a pond of normal size in the English countryside inhabited by an animal community which may well include representatives

of almost every phylum, from the lowliest unicellular animals and plants up to fishes and water-birds. By far the most numerous strands are those connected with food-supply, a matter of predators and prey, and these are the special concern of the ecologist. There are many others. Perhaps the most important is parasitism. Most animals are afflicted with parasites, living on or within them, to a varying extent at their expense. There are special instances concerned with reproduction and dispersal. For example the fresh-water mussel produces larvæ equipped with hooks, by means of which they attach themselves to fishes and so secure their wider dispersal. Another and rarer form of dependence, where benefit derived may well be mutual, is that known as symbiosis, a form of living together on terms of the closest intimacy. For instance, one species of the common hydra of our ponds and ditches is coloured a vivid green, because the cells of its body-wall are populated with immense numbers of unicellular plants. The same is true, on occasions, of our fresh-water sponges. In these instances the animal concerned derives oxygen from the life-processes of the plant, while the plant gains nitrogen from the food of the animal. Then there is commensalism, common among animals of the seashore, a less intimate association in which one partner benefits from the crumbs that fall from the table of the other. The sea-anemone living on the shell of the hermit-crab is an example. Yet another form of dependence, commoner in tropical than in temperate regions, is mimicry, where one insect palatable to birds imitates the appearance of another which predators have learned to avoid because of its nauseous flavour. There are further complications. No animal community is quite the same by night as it is by day; nor, to an even greater extent, is it the same in winter as in summer.

Underlying all these examples of the dependence of animals on one another, there is a much more fundamental one, the absolute dependence of all animals on plants. All flesh is grass. Without plants there could be no animals whatsoever. The reason for this is simple. Plants differ from animals in being able to manufacture their own food. Their green colouring-matter, with the assistance of sunlight, turns simple substances into complex sugars and starches. This is beyond the power of animals, who must

live either directly on plants or on plant-eating animals. Whether amœba or man, we are all herbivores. Every animal community therefore owes its existence to the plants that share its habitat ; and this form of dependence, while of capital importance, is by no means the whole of the debt that one half of the world of living things owes to the other. Besides supplying them with food, plants give shelter to animals, shelter from rain, from excessive sunlight, and, most important of all, from the insidious danger of desiccation. Nor is this all. There is for instance the dependence, a mutual one, between nectar-gathering insects and flowering plants. The flowers provide nectar and pollen as food for the insects, while they in return ensure the cross-pollination of the plants. In the whole realm of nature there are no instances of association more exquisitely adjusted, in a thousand different ways, than these. The two forms of life are so closely linked that their evolution has proceeded on parallel lines, the mouth-parts, even the hairy garment of the insects, adapting themselves to the necessity of pillaging the flowers ; while at the same time the colours, the fragrance, the detailed anatomical structure of the flowers have all been brought about so as to make that pillaging easier and its results more dependable. It is perhaps true that in this instance the plants owe a bigger debt to the animals than the animals to the plants, and this leads to the question as to what it is that animals in general do to repay their tremendous debt. The cross-pollination of flowering plants is part of the answer, but great as it is, no more than a part. Animals make their recompense in the most wholehearted and dramatic manner possible. Not only do they make the waste products of their bodies available to the plants, but they render up those bodies themselves, when their brief life-span has worn to its close, and so in decay provide their benefactors with the simple substances they require. In this way do animals render notable service in making it possible for plants to provide a continuing supply of food for succeeding generations of their own kind. The recompense is complete : the circle is closed.

It is the business of the ecologist to find a way through this devious and wonderful labyrinth, and up to a point he has succeeded. Clearly food-supply is of fundamental importance, since it vitally affects every member of every

community. By means of it natural selection operates to eliminate the unfit and perpetuate the fit, to ensure the survival of those creatures best adapted to their environment. Darwin, in the third chapter of 'The Origin of Species', a hundred years ago, expressed in general terms as ably as anyone has done since what the modern ecologist is concerned with in his study of animal communities, pointing out in one well-known passage how the prevalence of certain kinds of clover in a district might well depend on the prevalence of cats, since cats prey upon mice and mice destroy the nests of humble-bees, while it is the humble-bees that pollinate the clovers. The present-day ecologist can express this idea of a chain of dependence in more precise terms, but Darwin anticipated him, and it is strange that the science of ecology, to which Darwin gave a lead so long ago, is a development of little more than the last thirty years.

An important principle recognised and stressed to-day is what is known as a food-chain. At one end are plants, whether in the form of myriads of microscopic one-celled forms such as diatoms, swarming both in fresh water and in the sea, or in that of grasses and other highly developed kinds, covering the land. In all communities there are animals feeding directly on these plants, other and larger animals feeding on the plant-eaters, others larger again feeding on them. So we have a chain of dependence, with plants in some form or other at one end and at the other a species of predator, itself immune from predation, except perhaps at the hand of man. The links of the chain are restricted in number, seldom more than five, sometimes only two or three. In some ways the word 'pyramid' expresses the truth more clearly than 'chain', and this too is used. It conveys the idea of the diminution in numbers from the broad base to the narrow apex.

An example taken from almost any English woodland should make this clear. This is a well-defined habitat supporting a community of animals dependent on one another and directly or indirectly on plants. At the base of the pyramid are the uncountable leaves of the trees. Immense numbers of aphids, or greenfly, feed on the leaves. Preying on the aphids is a smaller number of ladybird beetles, larger than the aphids. The beetles, in their turn, are preyed upon by a yet smaller number of finches, tits

or warblers, while the apex of the pyramid is represented by perhaps a single pair of raptorial birds such as sparrow-hawks. This is a typical, and comparatively simple, food-chain. The same woodland will show others, and there will be a different state of affairs at night, when owls take over from sparrow-hawks, preying not upon small birds, but upon mice. Conditions will be entirely different during the winter months, when far fewer insects are about and migrant birds are somewhere far to the south.

It is possible, and even common, for food-chains to link up with one another, to subdivide among themselves, until the entire food-cycle, or aggregate of food-chains, becomes bewilderingly complex. This is what happens in the sea, where the food-chains of the herring have been worked out, and are found to differ markedly according to the age of the fish. At each stage of the herring's life-history it feeds upon a number of different kinds of lowlier forms of life, some of which prey upon one another, while other forms prey upon the herring during the earliest phase of its development. All of them depend basically upon diatoms. In contrast with this exceedingly complex situation, others may be quite simple. In the African savanna, for instance, zebras and antelopes feed upon grass, while lions feed upon zebras and antelopes. On occasions one or more links in the chain may be by-passed. It is well known, for instance, that certain whales feed directly on immense numbers of minute crustaceans, collectively called krill, which are strained through their whale-bone sieves. Other large creatures of the sea, among them other kinds of whale, subsist also on the krill, but at second or third hand.

Thus the ecologist studies and compares habitats and their corresponding animal communities of widely varying character and size, all of them regulated by the food-chain and the pyramid of numbers. It is clear that the whole complex situation, according to which a small number of large creatures preys upon a larger number of smaller creatures, and so progressively downwards to the base of the pyramid, is based upon two biological laws: first that every carnivorous animal subsists on other animals which must be smaller than itself, but not of such minute size as to involve wasted time and energy in capturing them. This law is of general application, but two interesting exceptions may be mentioned. Many snakes, thanks to their poison-fangs,

are able to kill creatures of their own size or even larger. The other exception is the whale already referred to, which, because of a specialised structural adaptation, feeds upon great numbers of creatures less than an inch in length. The second law, also of general application, is that the smaller the creature the higher its rate of reproduction, and consequently the larger its numbers at any given time. Unicellular forms of life, as well as others considerably larger, but still low in the scale of development, reproduce their kind much more rapidly even than rabbits or mice. It is for this reason that the base of the pyramid is broad.

This leads to yet another and extremely important characteristic of animal communities. Within comparatively narrow limits they are kept in a state of equilibrium. The web of life remains a web, with a stable structure of interlocking strands. In any community the numbers of different kinds of animal remain very much the same over the years. Of course there are exceptions and they are apt to obtrude themselves on our attention. In some years there are many more wasps than in others. Plagues of defoliating caterpillars occur from time to time. Mass migrations of Norwegian lemmings, driven by overpopulation, have frequently been described. But such phenomenal disturbances of what we rightly call the balance of nature are comparatively rare and always short-lived. During the season following upon the plague, the balance reasserts itself and numbers are reduced to normal, or more often considerably below normal. This means that in nature overcrowding is an untoward event which must be checked. It is essential for the natural fecundity of living things to be restricted, and restricted it unquestionably is by means of what seems to us to be a savage and relentless struggle for existence, in which might, or more accurately fitness to survive, is right, and the unfit perish. Nevertheless it is possible that we are apt to make too much of the remorselessness of this struggle. Natural selection is regardful of the species: callous towards the individual. The purpose of the struggle is to protect and improve the species, whereas from the human point of view it is the individual that counts. Tennyson, who perhaps of all our poets was the keenest observer of the world of living things, was acutely aware of this conflict of attitudes:

Are God and Nature then at strife,  
That Nature lends such evil dreams ?  
So careful of the type she seems,  
So careless of the single life.

It is possible that our pessimism is not wholly justified. More than one piece of evidence seems to support this conclusion. We are inclined, for instance, to think of the predators of a species of animal as its enemies, and the word is used freely even among ecologists who might be expected to know better. Looked at from the point of view of the individual animal, a predator is unquestionably an enemy ; but from that of the species, a more accurate term would be friend, for without its accustomed predators the species would multiply so rapidly that overcrowding would inevitably result, and this might lead to total extinction through disease or shortage of food. Another point is that, while overcrowding may well be disastrous, it now seems that a reduction of numbers, or as we might say undercrowding, is almost equally so ; and this not because the level of extinction is being approached, but because below a certain optimum density the length of life, in some instances at least, becomes reduced, as does the rate of reproduction among those that are left. The reasons for this are not clearly understood, but it does begin to appear that some sort of give and take, some degree of mutual benefit, exists between members of a species, or even between one species and another. Perhaps it is not fantastic to suppose that, in some way other than the recognised forms of mutual dependence, animals need the near presence of their fellows if they are to achieve complete fulfilment of their being. Such notions as these may perhaps bring solace to those who are appalled, as Tennyson was, by the apparent ruthlessness of the struggle for existence in the world of nature.

LESLIE REID.

## Art. 9.—LAMENNAIS.

TIME's healing scrutiny has vindicated Lamennais. The centenary celebrations of 1954 voiced a nation's tribute to the unfrocked priest who sought a pauper's grave in Père Lachaise, a misty morning in the winter of 1854.

Félicité de la Mennais was born in 1782 into Bourbon France at the apex of her glory, at St Malo in Brittany to rich ship-owners. The death of his mother disrupted his home and throughout his life he lacked a sense of belonging. He read avidly, and while still in his teens had devoured Rousseau, whose influence permeated his life. His piety went parallel with his precocity; his school-fellows nicknamed him 'the bigot.' Then came Revolution and this anchorless child sought in Faith a shelter from the people's angers. The Terror followed. The Abbé Vielle would arrive secretly, say Mass while the maid kept watch, and then dress as a sailor and roll along, apparently drunk, to carry the Host to the dying. With horror they saw their king guillotined and reason deified at Notre Dame. The revolutionary saturnalia spent itself. The first Consul silenced the ideologues, carried through the Concordat, and Chateaubriand wrote his 'Génie du Christianism.' So religious romanticism was born. His brother Jean-Marie entered the priesthood; Féli hesitated. Yet religion had become part of him. He turned to God in utter self-effacement. In the menacing interlude of the Cent Jours, Féli thought himself threatened by the imperial police and, with the Abbé Carron, fled to the safety of England. Under Carron's influence on his return, he was ordained at Vannes. And a saintly priest he proved himself. He came on the public scene at a focal point in the story of France. In their baggage her enemies had returned her king. Around this restoration passions raged. With Louis XVIII there had returned the frivolous and unbelieving aristocracy who had incited Revolution. Exile had converted them to devotion and they exalted their new-found piety. There were royalists who deplored this dangerous dependence of the civil on ecclesiastical authority. They had been reared in the intellectual tradition of the Church of France and grew alarmed at the intrusion of clericalism in the government. They feared the consequences on traditional piety and ecclesiastical discipline. Especially was France

disturbed at the appearance of the 'Congregation' that in secret controlled governmental policy. Stendhal's 'Le Rouge et Noir' gives the atmosphere as Balzac's 'Le Curé de Tours' evokes the fears at this ecclesiastical restoration that dominated the royalist. The Ultras had able leaders, Labourdonnaye, Corbière, Benoît, de Villele, Bonald, Clauzel de Coussergue, Maccarthy. But they were driven to extremes, for they were haunted by a Jacobin peril. They saw themselves as the breakwater against red floods now that France had shed revolutionary heresies and was restored to the fidelity of her Christian vocation. They tried to return the realm to her ancient régime. No experience of government tempered their intransigence. They had come late into politics for most had lived removed from public affairs. Some had returned from their emigration and could not understand the new France. Many had spent their lives fighting the republic or the 'usurper.' They were unable to compromise with their memories. Into this passionate world Lamennais flung himself with his 'Essai sur l'Indifférence (en Matière de Religion).' He entered the lists in the advance-guard of militant Catholicism. He fought modernism. He challenged even the new Royalism by the touchstone of God's Church. For the position of the clergy was fragile. Under the Empire they had become submissive and constitutional priests exalted authority. This Lamennais regarded as servitude: 'The public salary that the priests receive constitutes a contract between religious and political society; lay society promises its tutelage and the church submission. What remains is not a Church but an inferior class of civil servants.' He hoped to devote himself to the intellectual and moral renovation of the clergy of France, above all to imbue them with their social vocation. Welcome indeed was he to the surprised Ultras. It appeared as if Bossuet and Fénelon had returned. He was hailed as a new Pascal, his home, La Chenaie, as a new Port Royal. The essays appeared in the flood-tide of the romantic movement and revealed a fresh and stately mind. All paid homage to its genius. Lamartine called it 'sublime,' Hugo found it 'frightening for the future,' Chateaubriand was 'certain it was secure for immortality.' Yet his thesis was dubious if arresting. He tried to renew the basis for Christian apologetics and, despairing of finding certainty in reason,

he sought a philosophy of belief based on authority. But what was this authority? He found it in 'the authority that had conferred on the Church its universality,' 'the authority that had made for the unity of Christendom,' the 'authority of the eternal Christianity in Man.' He gave such literary expression to the ideals of Authority that Chateaubriand called upon him to join his paper 'Le Conservateur,' which had become a political force from the articles of Bonald, Villèle, Martainville, O'Mahony to show the world that Conservatives were not a party of ignorance and prejudice, that they too had a philosophy based on reason, more reasonable than a philosophy of doubt and rebellion. Clearly the imperatives of reason led to opposing camps.

He dreamed of a Golden Age for Christendom. The reality was startling. He saw that the people despised religion, that anti-clericalism was rampant. Why? he pondered. Was it because the Church was linked to a discredited monarchy? For the hostility to the Bourbons grew. The counter-revolution, which had begun as a trickle under the restored Louis XVIII, became a flood under Charles X. Lamennais believed that the Church lost, not gained, by supporting a monarchy that antagonised. He stated his case in 'Progrès de la Révolution et la Guerre contre L'Église.' The anger of the Ultras was boundless. He had been accepted as Ultramontaine in religion, Ultra-Royalist in politics. In his austere Christianity, he denied that the value of the Altar was to be a prop of the throne and the clergy 'an ecclesiastical gendarmerie to protect aristocratic wealth and privilege.' If kings ruled by divine right, it was to obey divine will in order to hasten the kingdom without frontiers promised by Christ. He sensed the growing opposition against the Bourbons and foresaw without fear the coming revolution. He hoped by liberating the nation that it would also liberate the Church. The hour of social Christianity would sound. It was with no shock that he heard of the 'Trois Glorieuses,' the three glorious July days that saw the melancholy end of the Bourbons. Charles X escaped from the throne of his fathers, accompanied by Viscount Walsh and Lt.-Col. MacSheeby, descendants of Jacobites who had sheltered in France when the Stuarts fled. The White International of Legitimacy was everywhere rejected.

The accession of Louis Philippe marked a cleavage in the French imperium. Charles had been crowned in a religious ceremony that reflected the divine mystery of government. It was replaced by an inaugural oath before the Palais Bourbon. To the Lord's anointed there succeeded the first magistrate of the realm. To a King of France who was legitimate by birth and who succeeded by the Grace of God, there followed a King of the French who was delegated to the executive by a contract between deputies and the candidate. How would the Church fare? Lamennais left his retreat for Paris. He recognised that the revolution liberated forces of renovation which 'by attacking sinful thrones would deliver the Church from their wounding protection. The hate felt by the people towards the Church would no longer have as a pretext that the clergy blessed their oppressors.'

Amidst revolution he founded his paper 'L'Avenir' with the motto 'God and Liberty.' His programme was neither Jacobin nor rationalist. He pleaded for a popular, revolutionary Christianity purified from its subservience to lay power and building the Ideal City. He sought to disarm popular grudges against and secure the confidence of the masses in the Church. This appeal found an echo in Catholic consciences. In its fervour it recalled the age of the cathedrals. He pleaded for the Church Eternal, for the separation of Church from the state to prevent its subservience to temporal policy. He claimed for the Church her four liberties of Conscience, of Teaching, of the Press, of Association. And he caused a profound change in the public attitude to the Church. Mgr de Quelan, the Archbishop of Paris, remained romantically faithful to the princes in exile, but the clergy accepted the régime and gave up the active rôle they had, for their misfortune, played; while the people saw that here were Christians who defended the new society. Lamennais insisted that religion was not a political convenience. She still had a message for man. To the clergy he appealed: 'Ministers of Him who, born in a crèche, died on a Cross, return to your origins. Again steep yourself in poverty and suffering. Without any support but that of His Divine Word go down as did the twelve fishermen amidst the people and again begin the conquest of the world.' While Rochejaquelein, Falloux, Benois d'Azy had tried to reconcile monarchy and the

people and failed, 'L'Avenir' proposed to reconcile the Church and the people. The Paris revolution let loose pent-up forces of liberty against the alliance of powers that sought to screen their despotism by calling itself holy. Everywhere uprisings betrayed the anger, even in states ruled by the Holy Father. 'L'Avenir' focused popular feeling and gave rebellion religious hues. The response alarmed the powers. Metternich, who through the Holy Alliance ruled Europe, wrote to his ambassador at Rome that 'L'Avenir' 'confused social equality with evangelical equality and defended the most subversive theories of social order.' He begged him to see that the Pope condemned it.

Lamennais was aware of the anger of the powers and suspected their intrigues. With sublime love, he determined to throw himself at the feet of the successor of St Peter. Would he found a popular Catholic movement? With the support of the Pope he could defy Metternich as well as the Voltairian ministers of his bourgeois King. He set forth on a pilgrimage to Rome accompanied by Lacordaire and Gerbet. They arrived in December 1831 and were joined by Montalembert. So powerful was the cabal against them that only in March were they received. The meeting between Gregory XII and these pilgrims of liberty was a meeting between a papacy linked to temporal power and a priest who derided it. It failed. Gregory avoided all allusions to the cause of the visit and dismissed them with fine words, and as they left, broken-hearted, Lamennais felt the first cold doubt cloud his conscience. He felt his soul seared when a few months later the Pope issued the Encyclical 'Mirari Vos' condemning the principles for which 'L'Avenir' pleaded as 'absurd, delirious, execrable.' Lamennais was faced with the painful decision of denying his hopes or his Church. He knelt long before the Altar. Cardinal Pacca added that the Holy Pontiff disapproved his ideas on civil liberty. His prayer was answered. On September 1832 he announced, 'Convinced that we are unable to continue our work without placing ourselves in opposition to him whom God has charged to govern the Church, we declare our submission. "L'Avenir" will no longer appear.' Rome expressed herself satisfied and 'what was expected from him.'

But with bitterness in his heart, he retired to La

Chenaie followed by a hysteria of hate, for the powers were determined to abase this haughty priest. His pilgrimage to Rome blended with his life's pilgrimage. He passed through Lyons, where the desperate silk-workers were on strike, and their misery left an indelible mark on his soul. At La Chenaie he read the 'Acts of the Polish Nation' by the exiled Adam Mickiewicz and felt horrified by the Polish martyrdom, for the Orthodox Iron Tsar had crushed rebellion. Historic links between France and Poland were strengthened by Catholic ties and the political sympathies of Lamennais. He invited Mickiewicz to La Chenaie, where his contagious anger carried away the upbraided priest, who grew obsessed by the people's sufferings, the iniquities of governments, and the politic way Christianity was being distorted by the mighty. He gave vent to the overwhelmed feelings in '*Paroles d'un Croyant*.' It was launched by Sainte Beuve in April 1834. The effect was miraculous. It was translated into every European tongue. In two months some 200,000 copies were sold and sung throughout the world. The response was revolutionary. Metternich told the Nuncio in Vienna, 'In Belgium the effect was as great as if there were another revolution.' Montalembert records 'in Germany the press spoke of it as something mysterious and terrible, as if an army of invasion were threatening.' For the revolutionary content of the Bible was thrown into the political arena, the terrible angers of the prophets, the infinite love of the apostles; and he dared, in hardly veiled language, denounce the treason of the Church won over by wealth and honours and power. Metternich wrote to his ambassador at the Vatican: 'To burn heretics and their work is now out of date. In this case it is indeed regrettable.' The Pope gave way. On January 1835 the Encyclical '*Singulari Nos*' condemned 'the book small in size but immense in its power of evil, breaking all links of fidelity and submission towards princes and throwing everywhere the torch of sedition.' How could he act now? In anguish he prayed. It was his second grave conflict with the Holy Father. He had written it with no thought of conflict. He considered that he had done nothing reprehensible, for he had written of political matters. After he had been so careful in writing it, he considered that he could not retract. He had hoped that the Pope, by applying social Christianity to the world,

' would give direction to political movements that nothing could stop and make possible the magnificent alliance of faith and science, religion and liberty, progress and order.' He wrote to Montalembert : ' I am convinced after having defended the rights of God by defending those of the Church I will not abandon those of humanity, for it would be an offence against God.' He saw the ' rights of humanity ' everywhere crushed ; the brutality of the papal troops in Romagna outmatched the rebels. Yet he had no wish to break with the Church. His book was a cry of pain at the horrors of the repression. He felt that if he remained silent he would be an accomplice. As he saw it, the Church had disavowed Christ's social message. With sorrow he felt that he could no longer accept that the voice of the Church was the voice of God. He broke with Rome. He would accept no half-measures. In his angry logic he gave up the Church's dogmas. He ended the period of religious polemics in 1836 with ' *Affaires de Rome*,' in which he explained his relations with the Holy See and the problem of the Church faced with social duties.

In the previous year he had entered the political arena by defending strikers of Lyons and Paris. The revolting priest became a people's tribune. He left for Paris, where his fame gave him entry to a literary and musical coterie and where his religious philosophy flowered into political activity. He entered into relations with republicans and socialists : Carrel, Raspail, Reynaud, Leroux ; he also became a star in the firmament created by Marie d'Agoult, who had built up in the Hôtel de France, Rue Neuve Laffitte, a salon that recalled those of the eighteenth century. Here she gathered Liszt and Chopin, Heine and Berlioz, Nourrit and Meyerbeer, ' the saint of Brittany ' Lamennais, and George Sand, who outraged convention by dressing as a Turk and smoking a hookah. Because they were seen together enemies whispered that they were lovers. But Lamennais remained ascetically indifferent to women, merely ' bestowing upon her the politeness of a monk.' Moreover, because of her domineering insistence he grew to dislike women. He attacked her ideas on the rights of women, questioned her case for the equality of the sexes, and was antagonised by her loose notions on marriage. She considered him as a founder of a new Church : ' We prefer your reproaches to your silence.'

But Lamennais wrote to Vitrolles : ' I believe George Sand will forgive my irreverences, but she will never forgive St Paul for having said " Women, obey your husbands " ' ; and in his ' *Causeries du Lundi*, ' St Beuve records that ' Lamennais declared that he had never met a woman who could follow a serious discussion for more than a quarter of an hour. ' The group formed a journal, ' *Le Monde*, ' in which Lamennais wrote articles that were published as ' *Politique à l'Usage du Peuple* ' and Sand wrote her ' *Letters to Marcie*. ' In 1836 the salon trained a choir of 400 workers who sang a cantata, ' *La Destinée*, ' with words by Lamennais. They began the musical education of the people, for ' Art is not condemned for ever to be the pastime of the lazy and the enjoyment of the rich. '

But Lamennais did not neglect his social work. In 1835 he was asked to defend strikers in a fight with police. His acceptance began his apostolate as a Christian democrat. He grew more democratic and attacked not merely France's political system but her social structure. In 1837 he published ' *Le Livre du Peuple*, ' a confession of his political faith in democracy and his social hope in producers' co-operatives to create his new society. In 1839 his ' *L'Esclavage Moderne* ' denounced the people's oppressors : ' For the chains and whips of the modern slave is hunger. Slaves, rise and break your chains. ' In 1840 there appeared ' *Le Pays et le Gouvernement*, ' violent attacks on the ' parliamentary capitalism ' of that ' triumphant mediocrity ' the July Monarchy, for which he was tried and sentenced to a year's prison at Sainte Pelagie. He was now at the apex of his powers. Bakunin records how moved he was on reading his ' *Politique à l'Usage du Peuple*. ' Cabet, the author of ' *Voyage en Icarie*, ' sent him a copy in homage. Engels, looking round for a French co-operator for his ' *Annales*, ' thought of Lamennais as the most sympathetic mind. But he declined all co-operation. His plans for productive co-operatives as a solution to the social problem secured little following. In ' *Esquisse d'une Philosophie* ' he gave a kind of explanation for his contradictory life. Then in the winter of his life events passed him by. He antagonised Catholics by his ideas on society and socialists by his ideas on property. He retained a singular faith in universal suffrage as means

to better conditions and in productive co-operation as the key to social justice. He was now sixty-six and thought of retiring after a stay at Tremignon with his nephew Blaize, to end his days in peace, when revolution came again. In the February Revolution 1848, the bourgeois monarchy collapsed. What should follow? Even clergy now swung between royalism and a republic; many planted trees of liberty in front of their churches, explaining that the first had grown on Mount Calvary. After the short experiment of the 'Right to Work,' there followed the June suppressions, and Lamennais was disgusted at the brutality. In the Assembly he sat with Pierre Leroux and Louis Blanc, but he was so feeble that he could only speak in a whisper, yet founded 'Le Peuple Constituant.' Its circulation was enormous, but it failed nevertheless, the last number appeared framed in black and he pleaded: 'We need lots of gold to enjoy the right of speech. Silence to the poor.' He tried 'La Reforme,' but it was suppressed for denouncing the ambitions of President Napoleon. Guizot had diagnosed France well: 'Bonapartism represented national glory, a revolutionary guarantee, and a principle of authority.'

On Dec. 2, 1852, there took place Napoleon's coup d'état. Lamennais understood that he would not again see the sun of liberty. He spent his last days translating Dante's 'Divine Comedy.'

The following winter he caught pleurisy and took to bed. 'I want to be buried amidst and like the poor. Nothing should be placed on my tomb. My body should be carried to the cemetery without being presented to any church.' His condition deteriorated. His favourite niece, Mme Kertigny, came from Brittany and implored him to receive a priest. No—'Leave me in peace.' Two days later, Ash Wednesday, at dawn his coffin was taken from his home, Rue de Grand Chantier, for Père Lachaise. The government, fearing demonstrations prescribed a different route, forbade more than a half a dozen to follow, and advanced the time by an hour. But news spread and crowds formed. Cavalry guarded the entry, the prefect had the gates shut and only allowed a few to enter. The police charged . . . the body was lowered. There were no speeches, no flowers. The grave digger asked, 'Shall I put a cross?' 'No,' replied Auguste Barbet, his executor.

So he placed a stick on the grave. To it was tied a string with a piece of paper. On it was written 'La Mennais.'

So died among the poor the accepted founder of Christian Socialism, the Charles Kingsley of France.

He claimed to be Christian. But according to Catholics he went from God to the devil, from heaven to hell. He confessed, 'Outside Catholicism, the most complete expression of the traditions of the human race, I see nothing that resembles a religion. I remain therefore a Catholic. I do not associate myself with the political system of the chiefs of Catholicism.' When he broke with the Pope, he would not found a new Church. He wrote to Lerminier, who had praised him in '*Revue des Deux Mondes*'; 'I have not imitated Luther. I will never imitate him, persuaded as I am that schisms cause harm.' A case of conscience indicated his mind. At Béranger's house he had become friendly with a liberal-minded family, the Clements. In their château at Sans Souci in Champagne he wrote his '*Livre du Peuple*.' Their son Charles in 1840 expressed a wish to receive his first communion. Mme Clement wrote for advice. He replied: 'To-day the old faith is dying and a new faith is being born in harmony with the imperishable instincts of Man. But until that has happened, Catholicism being the Christian communion that has best conserved the essential spirit of the institutions of Jesus Christ, I see no reason to deprive oneself of the support one finds in the established rites.' He resumed the eternal dialogue between finite human reason and the infinite wisdom of Mother Church. But replied Gerbet: 'The Bible interpreted by the people without a Hierarchy resembles in nothing Christianity.' Moreover, a religion postulates a mystique, dogmas, institutions. The Christianity of Lamennais contains nothing of these. For he belonged to no religion on this earth, but to the absolute religion of souls. His faith in his own self-made religion of humanity was deep. He wrote to his friend, Eugène Nore, the future Superior General of the Lazarites, 'I believe that from this eternal root of faith will grow a tree that will be grand and beautiful and which will cover the earth with its shadow.'

Yet what he proposes is a recognition of generous principles such as fraternity, liberty, and equality, in which he sees the 'eternal laws of society' and which he identifies

with 'social' Christianity. Eugène Forgues, who watched over his last moments and whom Lamennais asked to publish his papers, records: 'He died tranquil in the faith he had made for himself.' Before dying he was absorbed in silent prayer. With a sigh he murmured, 'These are good moments.' Happy are the dead who die in the Lord. Where are they? Who can tell?

Socialism has no written constitution. It embraces a doctrine of revolt linked to a doctrine of hope. Lamennais' political activity was determined by the revolution of 1830 and the insurrections of 1831 and 1834.

In the July Revolution of 1830 the bourgeoisie secured their monarchy, but the people asked for whom they had fought, for they were left out in the political wilderness. 'L'Avenir' denounced the narrow franchise: 'You ask a Frenchman—how much taxes do you pay? One replies I pay 240 francs. Good. Go and vote. And how much do you pay? I pay 239 francs 99 centimes. You can't vote. For the assumption is that you are a fool.' The Lyons strikes decided him. 'Never have I seen such a touching sight as this heroic city that fell into the hands of simple workers after an heroic combat. The people were driven to despair and cried, "Let us live by working or die fighting."'

In January 1834 another insurrection was cruelly suppressed. Three months later appeared 'Paroles d'un Croyant.' St Beuve reported: 'My workers can't set it without being so as to speak transported. The printing press is all in the air.' There had been a brutal fight in Rue Transonain and the Government prosecuted the captured. For these 'April trials' the workers chose Lamennais to defend them. So great was his prestige that when in 1839 the Blanquists attempted insurrection they placed him in the government that was to take control of the realm. And it was made without his knowledge. In the following year he was imprisoned at Saint Pelagie. Yet in spite of his political martyrdom his influence was undecisive. French society was passing through a transitional stage. Men and women were arriving from the country to work in the new metallurgical and textile industries and were lost in their new environment. In Britain in this age, Chartists had a common goal of manhood suffrage for a national parliament. But in France

there was no common goal. Political republicanism jostled with utopian socialism. Working-class action took the form of strikes and the uprooted labourers came on the scenes in violence and revolt. Heine records how on the funeral of General Lamargue the republicans fought bitterly at Rue St Martin. But there was no unity in objective or methods. Some dreamed of reconstructing society on the basis of self-governing workshops, some on the right to work. Yet Prudhomme and Louis Blanc were reformist. Blanquism stood for revolution. Lamennais remained outside the fray. He would not see the people as a proletariat. For him the people enshrined a divine mystique. He would not divide society into capitalist and proletariat classes. He saw society in terms distant from material. Progress meant for him a return to God. 'If many are in want it is because Man has troubled the order established by God.' He insisted on personal property as the basis of personality. He developed a plan to democratise credit. Workers would create 'communal banks under state direction to make possible producers' co-operatives that with universal suffrage would make for his just society. He refused to be called a socialist. 'I have been asked, are you a socialist? If you mean by socialist systems of St Simon and Fourier and whose general character is the negation of property and family, then, No, I am not a socialist. If you mean by socialism the principle of association as a fundamental principle of the order to be established, then I am a socialist.' Yet when founding 'Annales Franco-Allemandes' Arnold Ruge and Karl Marx both counted on him as one of the French collaborators. But there was no French contributor in the only number, 1844. The Communist Dezamy voiced their embitterment. 'You moved our passions. You made of our hearts a volcano and of our heads a furnace. And when we ask you a remedy, you bring despair into our hearts. You deify property, which is the source of our ills and tyrannies. You legitimise the exploitation of people and render social disorder eternal.' Yet although he was disowned, his self-sacrifices made his life an important landmark in working-class emancipation. He took his priest's cassock and threw it over the democratic and social movements of the age.

Opinions on him are as contradictory as his life. He

was a royalist, yet he was pursued by the royal courts. He began as a defender of the clergy: he abandoned them. He was Ultramontane in a world that retained a nostalgia of Gallicanism. Yet he was condemned by the Pope. He began as a champion of orthodoxy; he died as a heretic. He championed authority, yet he was imprisoned for his plea for liberty.

When the 'Paroles' appeared disapproval was universal. Those who pretended to know claimed it was prepared during a meeting of the chiefs of secret societies. 'He had planted the red cap of revolution on the cross'; 'It was the bible of insurrection'; 'He was Robespierre donning a cassock' and 'Marat setting up as a prophet.' Saint Marc Girardin wrote in 'Journal des Debats': 'It was the evangel of revolt, the apocalypse of sedition.' All were in accord with the papal encyclical. The anti-clericals joined the clericals in abuse. Renan, writing in 1866, maintained: 'I should have preferred that he remained thinker and poet and not occupied himself with the world and her revolutions. He lost his common sense over the rebellions.'

Patarrieu Lafosse, the prosecuting attorney in 1840, expressed the general astonishment: 'Has any one ever seen such a complete change? The Revolution against which he spent himself in 1816, he now wishes to propagate throughout Europe. As much as he then was the detractor of the blind instincts of the mob, he is now their flatterer.' But as the century sped on opinions veered. The Mennaisian programme was being fulfilled. The flow of public life justified his life. It was seen that his teachings, far from being seditious, were foreseeing and constructive. So Louis Barthou affirmed in 'Revue des Deux Mondes,' 1923: 'Lamartine's social doctrines that so scandalised the Church a century ago have found their most liberal expressions in the Encyclical of Leo XIII on the condition of workers, while the advent of democracy has realised his constant political prophecies.' This new Mennaisian loyalty received its strangest tribute from Carcopino, the defender of the Vichy Government. Writing in 1942 to justify the government of defeat, he insists that the National Revolution found its roots in Lamennais's teachings. 'The path Lamennais traced in social and political evolution resembles in all points those indicated by Marshal Pétain. He con-

sidered property as the inherent right of human personality and appealed for the principle of association in a sense wide enough to embrace the corporative régime.' For in spite of contradictions, his life was creative. There was Lamennais whom Renan and Littré and Ferry recognised as the first prose writer of the century. There was Lamennais the founder of romantic Catholicism, the spiritual brother of Mickiewicz, the collaborator of George Sand, the inspirer of Liszt; and the Mennaisian programme became realised. His dream of social Catholicism found expression in the Encyclicals 'Rerum Novarum,' 1891, and 'Quadragesimo Anno,' 1931, and on their programme has been built Catholic Trade Unions (C.F.J.C.) and the policy of the M.R.P. The separation of Church and State in 1906 realised an objective which he thought essential for the health of the Church. The Pontifical Monarchy never degenerated to a Caesarism. By the end of the century, the levers of the Church of France were held by Mennaisians. Christian democracy, social Catholicism, a Catholic press stem from his teaching. He taught that the Church had social and humanitarian duties as well as religious for he equated them.

He rose to the sublime in character not by the power of his intellect, nor the compass of his learning, but by the holiness of his love for man. He preached the Good News that had been preached by Christ the Carpenter on the hills of Gallilee. 'God has not created the limbs of his children that they be broken by irons nor their soul that it be wounded by servitude. All are born equal. No one is born with the right to command. If someone orders you and insists "You are mine," reply, "No, we belong to God our Father and Christ who alone is our Master."'

VICTOR COHEN.

Art. 10.—GERMANY, AUSTRIA AND CENTRAL EUROPE:  
A HISTORICAL RETROSPECT.

PART I

A FASCINATING speculation facilitates the understanding of history, namely to recall bygone plans and ideas which, but for certain events which turned out differently, or for certain once-plausible expectations which did not materialise, might have become decisive historical factors.

It is human to attribute more importance to hopes than to fears. Thus, we are inclined to attribute historical results to projects or efforts made to realise them. Statesmen have more often, however, been concerned with something they wished to avoid than with something they truly desired. Results in history—empires, federations, alliances, institutions—have more often than not been created for defence; they have often survived the threat to meet which they were set up, and then the danger was forgotten. They might have turned out quite differently if certain events had taken another course, but the side which benefited most from the actual result acquired the habit of praising that result as a providential fact which only miscreants could question. It was the best of possible worlds for all the other people. Then when a new turn of history made the once victorious side into the loser, it was quickly discovered that the losing side and all its achievement was beset with original sin, so that its collapse and defeat was a 'historical necessity,' a punishment for its sin. Jacob Burckhardt said that 'the aim of most writing on recent history is to give pain to someone.'

This is perhaps nowhere truer than in historical writing on German unity, with its subsidiary chapter, Austria's exclusion from Germany, her subsequent decadence as a European power and her final dissolution.

German unity was weakened by fear in the seventeenth century. The fear was that the closer the princely German states were kept together, the more likely (with or without any religious pretext) would their claims and grievances weaken the Imperial central power, and the more often would the French rival have an opportunity to intervene; such an intervention would have paralysed the action of Austria as a European power. Simultaneously the weakening of German unity served the French interests. Thus it

facilitated appeasement between the two chief Continental powers, France and Austria, whose rivalry was the principal cause of the wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—until the dynastic change in Spain and the treaty of Utrecht in 1714 relieved France from her fear of encirclement.

German unity became topical in the nineteenth century through a new fear. Experience had proved throughout the Napoleonic wars that the main Continental powers of the East and the West, Russia and France, were likely to clash over the body of an impotent Germany, unless the whole of Germany was confederated under the guarantee of the two semi-German powers Austria and Prussia. The first had been 'semi-German' since its union with Hungary in 1527. It had been a European great power since its dynastic connection with Spain and remained so despite the termination of this connection in 1714, on account of the Italian dependencies which fell to Austria in the final peace between Bourbon and Habsburg and on account of the Este and Medici inheritances which came to the Hapsburg-Lorraines by matrimonial links in the course of the eighteenth century. The second, Prussia, was made semi-German and semi-Slav by the very origin of the Prussian royal title, given by the Polish Confederation in 1701. The partitions of Poland almost made Prussia more Polish than German, as the following facts suggest.

In the last few years of the eighteenth century, Warsaw had several visits from the Prussian royal couple, Frederick William III and his beautiful Queen Louise. They were well received there. For several years there was a Polish party grouping round Prince Anton Radziwill, married to Princess Louise of Prussia, the sister of the romantic Louis-Ferdinand, the poet-musician prince who was killed in action against Napoleon in 1806. St Clement Hofbauer and the Redemptorists, called the 'German fathers' by the Poles, chose Warsaw under Prussian rule as the centre of their missionary endeavour to revive German Catholicism. Free of the fetters of the regional division imposed by the Treaty of Westphalia, which by that time had ceased to be the real constitution of Germany, German Catholicism could hope for such a revival under a Protestant king. E. T. A. Hoffmann, the author of the 'Tales,' was a Prussian civil servant in Poland in these years; his

letters written from that city prove that Warsaw played some part in the new Romantic trend in German literature, which began at the turn of the century. The partition of Poland can be blamed as a diplomatic transaction which was contrary to the Common Law of Europe. The last King of Poland, Stanislas-Augustus Poniatowski, though a Russian satellite in his policy, protested against the third Partition in the name of Common Law; Maria-Theresa protested against the first one in the name of the same principle. Burke made out a strong case against it and Friedrich von Gentz added that it had done more than anything else to destroy the balance of power in Europe, and argued that the French *ancien régime* brought about its own fall by condoning it and thus forcing Austria into the Russo-Prussian orbit, instead of remaining within the Franco-Austrian alliance of 1756, which Maria-Theresa would have preferred to preserve. It is none the less certain that the partition, however blameworthy, had nothing to do with a 'Slav versus German' problem. If it had not been for the subsequent Napoleonic wars, Prussia might have become more Slav than German through this partition. The 'Slav versus German' issue is a highly posthumous construction on the subject, made by patriotic historians of both sides.

Between 1806 and 1813, Prussia became the refuge of German 'resistants' and malcontents from the West, who preached there a new 'Germanic mission.' The most substantial part of Poland had again been separated from Prussia, first by Napoleon in 1807, when he made the Saxon king 'Grand-Duke of Warsaw,' then in 1814-15, when Poland was re-partitioned by the Vienna Congress, which gave the bulk of the country to the Tsar as a separate kingdom, placed under the guarantee of a constitution approved by the Congress. Prussia received compensation in the west of Germany for the loss of the Polish territories. Thus the 'German vocation' of the Kingdom of the Hohenzollerns was confirmed by diplomacy. Prussia was made a depository of the 'German idea,' although up to 1813 she cared little for this idea, and only then accepted it reluctantly. The *Tugenbund* and the other secret societies in which the German national mysticism began to flourish were an unwelcome ally to the Prussian generals and ministers; even in von Stein's famous Königsberg

manifesto, the emphasis was on a 'Germanic constitution' which was part of the 'Common Law of Europe.'

In the next major crisis, which came after a long interval, Austrian and Prussian links with the German Federation prevented these two powers from taking an active part in the Crimean War. The minor German states were anxious to keep the good relations with Russia which had prevailed since 1814, and were not therefore prepared to follow Austria, if the latter allied herself with the Western powers, as she intended. The head of this neutralist movement in Germany was the Saxon prime minister Baron von Beust. Throughout the Crimean War, Lord Clarendon sent strongly worded notes to Dresden. On the other hand, the minor German states would have resisted Prussia firmly if some of the advisers of Frederick William IV had succeeded in making her side with Russia. The bloc of West-German states was a force working for neutrality in Europe, which saved Russia from a crushing defeat in the Crimea, but which at the same time saved France from a possible Prussian threat to her Rhine frontiers. It was again the German Confederation which contained the war of 1859 within Italy by threatening to intervene should the French army enter Austrian territory proper—a prospect which was unpleasant both to Napoleon III and Francis-Joseph, who thereupon decided to terminate hostilities. If German unity was unwelcome to the former as an enemy, it was unwelcome to the latter as an ally. The conservative instinct in Austria wished to restrict wars to rival powers and states; Austria had a horror of 'sacred national wars.' For some time the Prussian attitude was not dissimilar. In 1850 it was Prussian conservatism which for the same reason accepted diplomatic defeat; Schwarzenberg was able to dictate his conditions at Olmütz because the King of Prussia was unwilling to appeal to German nationalism and a 'People's war' as a possible ally.

Both the great German powers were anxious to play a part in Europe. Austria had a more established claim to do so and a longer experience in the matter. For a long time she was an ally of Britain, essential to British policy. Since 1860 new prospects for an Austro-French alliance had appeared; the obstacle to such an alliance was eliminated through the cession of Lombardy. Any

expansion of Prussia towards the east was blocked by Russia, both in Poland and the Baltic provinces. Thus, the theatre in which Prussia was able to play a European rôle became the German west, although a strong school of thought in Berlin considered the east as the 'natural' direction for expansion.

Any study of political history is incomplete if it does not consider this phenomenon of fear—nineteenth-century German history is a case in point. The rise of Prussia is a history of the fear of isolation, a fear removed by the combination of favourable moments, energetic diplomacy, and a new military technique in the years between 1866 and 1870.

It is often said that the German Reich plunged Europe into two wars in 1914 and 1939. This is true, and as far as the Second World War is concerned it is even right to accuse Germany alone. Yet we ought to add, in historical retrospect, that if the German *Reich* caused two world wars in our century, the German *Bund* prevented two world wars in the last one; this consideration ought not to be forgotten when we deal with the once more topical problem of 'Germany's function in Europe.'

As things have turned out, we are left with the impression which still prevails to-day—in a situation which has been completely reversed by Prussian Germany's defeat in two world wars—that German unity was inevitable in the form in which it came about. This is an error. There was the Austrian idea of Germany; there were also concepts which were more pro-Austrian than pro-Prussian, which deserve to be recalled at present as having more than a passing interest.

The non-Prussian conception of German unity was represented by Bismarck's most notable opponent, the Saxon statesman Baron von Beust. He is quite forgotten at present, even in England, where he represented his king before 1848 as Plenipotentiary to the Court of St James. He was subsequently the first and the last Ambassador in London of the German Confederation in 1863, and as such he was disliked by the Prince and Princess of Wales, for his instructions were to make Britain accept the separation of Schleswig-Holstein from Denmark, the native country of the future Queen Alexandra. This separation was the famous problem which Palmerston described as 'only

understood by three men, the late Prince Consort, who died before acquainting anyone with it, a German Professor who went mad, and myself, who although still alive and sane, have forgotten every word about it.' In 1866 Bismarck made Beust's resignation a condition of peace with Saxony, but Francis-Joseph made the 'war-criminal' a naturalised subject of Austria. He subsequently became the Imperial Chancellor who achieved the Compromise with Hungary and founded the liberal parliamentary era in Austria. He fell from office in 1871, on account of the Prussian victory over France, but for the next ten years was Francis-Joseph's Ambassador to Queen Victoria, then to the Third Republic. In these posts he was once more Bismarck's pet enemy, for his endeavour was to link Austria to the Western powers, and isolate Bismarck's Reich. Beust could say to-day that a part of his idea has come true at long last. He envisaged a German union of the minor states without Austria and without Prussia, which were to remain semi-German border states, allied by certain links to 'Germany proper.' Except for the fact that they were great powers, able to defend Germany against Russia in case of need, their function would have been similar to that of Switzerland and the Netherlands, semi-German states separating Germany from the West by their neutrality. Beust's project differs, however, from present-day reality, in that his native Saxony would have belonged to the West-German Federal Union, and that 'semi-German' Austria and Prussia would have been two great powers, with Hungary linked to the former, while some Polish and Lithuanian provinces, perhaps an independent Poland, would have been linked to the latter. Before Bismarck and the *Kulturkampf* of 1873, Prussia was not considered the arch-enemy of the Poles. On the contrary, towards the middle of the century many Poles were in sympathy with her, as later they were with Austria and earlier with Russia, under the liberal era of Alexander I between 1814 and 1825.

A still earlier non-Prussian concept of German unity, but this time in combination with east central Europe, was the plan of Prince Felix Schwarzenberg in 1851. This Austrian statesman was at that moment sure that England and France would sooner or later conclude a definite alliance. In those days that would have represented a

force about equal to that of Russia. Between west and east Schwarzenberg envisaged a centre, equal to both, partly German and partly Slav, Hungarian, and perhaps Rumanian (although this name was still almost unknown to describe the 'Danubian Principalities'). The non-German majority of the central federation would have been a guarantee for France that no aggression was intended on the Rhine, since the Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, etc., were not interested in German aspirations. Schwarzenberg had no final view on Italy; he considered, however, that the Italian problem was an Austrian interest, and not a matter of indifference to the Western powers, and so in 1849 he began negotiating an agreement with London and Paris on it. Owing to Radetzky's victory over Piedmont, his position was strong in negotiation; yet he was ready to make far-reaching concessions, such as the cession of Lombardy to Piedmont, to reassure France that Austria would never again threaten her Alpine frontier. France did not want a great power on her Alpine frontier; Britain did not want a great power in Italian ports; Austria did not want a great power in Lombardy. Some formula for an Italian independence on federal lines might have been evolved from all these interests, perhaps even some Italian support for the central federation, in order to increase the non-German majority.

Finally, Constantin Frantz, Bismarck's famous literary opponent, envisaged a Prusso-Polish union, more or less like Austria-Hungary. All this was rendered impossible by Austria's defeat in 1866, a defeat due more to the hesitations of minor German states, especially Bavaria, than to anything else. Karl Marx was sure that Prussia would be beaten and that Austria would face, not a 'Prussian and Royal Germanism,' but a 'true' one, that is to say a social-revolutionary German nationalism. For a while Marx's hope was disappointed, only to come true later, over the ruins of both Austria and Prussia, which Marx would have surely thought to be a joyful prospect. Yet the German form of national and socialist mystique was not quite what Marx hoped to see, hostile as he was to his Jewish compatriots.

Prussia was victorious in 1866. Yet Prussian fears only disappeared when the efforts of defeated Austria failed to create an alliance with the West; only then did some

Prussians feel that the law of the Continent could be dictated from Berlin. The fatal turn in Austria's destinies began at this point, and this was also the tragic turn in Europe's destiny.

## PART II

The very name Austria shows that it is a complementary part of the West. The name *Oesterreich* is meaningless if it were not for the fact that there used to be a *Reich* in the West. Not a German Reich, but a Christian one, although empirically 'Germandom' was its bulwark. The name *Oesterreich* indicates that the Middle Ages already recognised—perhaps much better than later generations did—the necessity for a regional division of unity, a regional function to be performed by a single state. The Occidental Empire was weakened and reduced by the religious crisis, by the Bourbon-Hapsburg rivalry, and finally by the secession of Holland and Switzerland in the Peace of Westphalia. The eastern branch, Austria, kept the nominal leadership of the Empire as long as this institution lasted. The real basis of the Austrian power was, however, the union in 1527 of Austria, Bohemia, and Hungary. The King of Bohemia, Ferdinand I, brother of Charles V, stood at the head of this union at first, not the Emperor himself. On the abdication of Charles V in 1556, the Imperial Crown was united to the crown of Hungary. Then the difficulties began.

Hungary joined the union upon definite assurances that her direct Papal privileges and her ancient laws would remain intact; no similar assurance was needed in Bohemia, because although it was a kingdom, Bohemia formed part of the Empire. The rule of the Emperors over Hungary was in any case a claim rather than a reality until the whole country was reconquered, a hundred and fifty years later, from the Turks. When the male line of the Hapsburgs became exhausted with Charles VI, the necessity for a continued union between Austria and Hungary was codified in the Pragmatic Sanction. Salic law excluded Maria-Theresa from the imperial office and might have excluded her from any hereditary sovereignty within the Empire. Pragmatic considerations prevailed, however, and they were 'sanctioned.' As the right of female inheritance was based on Hungarian and not on imperial law, Maria-Theresa's title in international relations was

'Queen of Hungary.' This was no sentimental concession to Hungary, but a legal necessity ; there was even question of uniting all her dominions under the title 'Kingdom of Hungary' (as Ferdinand I's dominions were the 'Kingdom of Bohemia' on maps seen by Shakespeare) or else under the Roman name of 'Kingdom of Pannonia.' This would not have been more illogical or arbitrary than including the German Marches of Brandenburg into the (originally Slavonic) 'Kingdom of Prussia.'

Likewise in 1867, when Beust restored the Hungarian constitution in Francis-Joseph's name, legalist and pragmatic political considerations prevailed rather than any partiality for Hungary. Some English publicists and historians, as well as others, have attributed this 'compromise' to some romantic idea of a German and Magyar '*Herrenvolk*' who, it is alleged, divided the Hapsburg monarchy between them, submitting the Slav 'servant races' to their rule. Nothing is further from the truth and from the pragmatic mind both of Beust and the Magyar statesmen Deák, Eötvös, and Andrassy, with whom he negotiated and concluded the agreement.

The main fact to be considered was that the *diploma Ferdinandiana* of 1527, confirmed by the Pragmatic Sanction in 1723, made it perfectly clear that Hungary was not part of the Holy Roman Empire and she was thus not part of its successor, the Austrian *Kaiserstaat* of 1806. Empirically it was part of the European Hapsburg power, usually called 'Austria' ; legally it was not. Only in 1849 was Hungary's self-government abolished by a military state of siege, the justification of which was the 'restoration of the legal order.' Yet Francis-Joseph did not rule over Hungary because he was the military conqueror of the country, but because Hungary had come to him by legitimate inheritance. It sounded illogical to argue, as some Austrian centralists and federalists did, that Kossuth's revolutionary government of 1849 was unconstitutional and illegal and unrepresentative of Hungary, and at the same time that the suppression of Hungary's ancient constitution was a 'punishment' for the actions of Kossuth. In February 1849, the Austrian parliament voted for a federalist constitution which had been drafted by the Czech historian Frantisek Palacky. This was mainly directed against the Frankfurt Assembly, which claimed

that Austria ought to submit to a Central German authority residing in Frankfurt. Palacky's constitution affirmed the full independence of the Hapsburg Realm and thus far it was welcome to Schwarzenberg. Yet Hungary could not be included into it, because she had no representative in the parliament which voted for it and because Prince Schwarzenberg, as Austrian Prime Minister, had no competence over Hungary. During the stage of siege, this latter country was the concern of the Commander-in-Chief, Field-Marshal Prince Alfred Windischgraetz, who was in charge of operations against Kossuth. Sooner or later the state of siege had to come to an end. It was gradually abolished, and slow but clear steps were taken towards the restoration of a constitutional order.

More than half the road in this direction had been traversed by 1867. A Marxist-sounding theory, widespread amongst historians, tries to prove that the 'class-solidarity' of the Prussian Junkers and the Magyar 'feudal' gentry was responsible for this new situation and that subsequently the Magyar 'feudal' statesmen kept firmly to the Prussian alliance. This theory is posthumous to the true situation of 1867. If at that time any nation expressed a wish that self-government should be restored to Hungary, it was France, and not Germany, as all the documents show. Napoleon III desired an alliance with Austria, but with an Austria which was 'less German,' a power which had no ambition to unite all the other Germans under her leadership. The question in 1867 was confined to this: was Hungary's restored constitution to be the one which existed in 1847, or were some of the reforms of 1848, duly sanctioned by the crown, to be restored as well? It may be argued that Beust ought to have made such modifications as would have satisfied Croat, Rumanian, and Serb subjects of the Crown of Hungary. It may perhaps be said that he made too many concessions to Hungary in the political field and too few in the economic field. At any rate, when the essentials of the 1848 constitution had been restored in Austria, it was impossible to deny the legality of the laws of 1848 in Hungary. Austria also had to replace her bureaucracy by a liberal constitutional government. The Germans of Austria, through being excluded from the German Confederation, had lost their field of activity at the Frankfurt Assembly; they needed

a compensation in the form of a parliament in Vienna. Beust had been a disciple of the 'English model' ever since his days as a young diplomat in England. He imagined a party government for Austria, composed alternatively of conservatives and liberals. Liberalism was the order of the day after 1866, as well as reflecting Beust's personal views. Austria had ceased also to be one of the powers bound to protect the Holy See when she abandoned Venice in 1866 and withdrew from the Italian peninsula. Her Concordat with the Holy See had to be revised in these circumstances, if not abrogated altogether.

During Beust's term of office as Imperial Chancellor (the title was never again used after his tenure of it) the revision of the Concordat was almost as important an issue as the 'compromise' with Hungary, although the two issues were closely linked. The Hungarian hierarchy always maintained—in opposition to Cardinal Schwarzenberg, the Prime Minister's brother, who was the chief architect of the Concordat of 1855—that from the point of view of Canon Law, Hungary had never been subject to any foreign state and that the Primate of Hungary was the direct and personal Legate of the Popes. The Hungarian hierarchy did not consider that the Concordat of 1855 had anything to do with their country. So, although the Hungarian bishops were hostile to Kossuth's party and loyal to the dynasty, they were deeply concerned over the restoration of self-government to their country. In order to govern the non-Hungarian part of the Dual Monarchy with liberal support, Beust had to rely mainly on the Germans of Bohemia and of 'Austria proper'; the Tyrol was devoted to his chief opponent, Cardinal Schwarzenberg and the 'Concordat Party,' and so were the Slovene provinces of the south. The fact that the Liberal Party, at that time in power, was reluctant to lose its strongest contingent in the Vienna Parliament, the German Bohemian or Sudeten-German group, explains why the autonomy of Bohemia was never codified and Francis-Joseph never crowned in Prague. Moreover, Bohemia formed part of the *Kaiserstaat*, while Hungary did not.

The men who founded the new régime of 1867 did not consider the Czechs 'inferior' to the Magyars, but they found that in historic public law Hungary had a better case for autonomy than Bohemia. They did not believe

in the German *Herrenvolk*, but they found that the German language spoken by Germans and Slavs as a *lingua franca* was a powerful support for the unity of the Monarchy. In fact, they used more Slavs in the state service for the simple reason that an educated German seldom spoke a Slav language, whereas every educated Slav spoke German in addition to his mother-tongue, and was thus useful as a multilingual civil servant.

As to Magyar supremacy in the crown lands of Hungary, this was not an artificial imposition, but an empirical fact. The Magyar language had a sufficient literature by 1867 to be a vehicle of higher schooling and university training. Croat, Rumanian, and Slovak developed to a similar standard only in later decades; Croatia was, at any rate, autonomous under the Hungarian crown and had schooling and higher studies in her own language. 'Magyarisation' spread after 1867, not because of any violence imposed upon Slovaks or Rumanians, but because industrial progress drew Slovak and Rumanian peasants away from their homeland to Magyar regions.

The 'compromise' and the 'dualist' system, notwithstanding the real mistakes committed in its name, was hardly the cause of the downfall and dissolution of Austria in 1918. The cause of this must be sought elsewhere, in the one-sided reliance of Austria on Berlin.

Beust and his successor, Count Julius Andrassy, worked hard for doors to be opened in London and Paris. They did not want to rely entirely upon Berlin; they envisaged a possible conflict with Russia, despite efforts made to reconstruct Metternich's Austro-Prussian-Russian triangle. They looked to the West for support in case Germany grew too strong for them as an ally, as Metternich had found support in Britain against Russian expansion, although he successfully maintained the Russian alliance for thirty-five years.

France after 1870 did not count for much; until the 1890s she had no alliances and then she signed one with Russia. Britain under the Liberals ceased to have a truly consistent European policy. Some Liberals were isolationist. Others were 'imperialist,' only interested in bases for raw materials outside Europe. Gladstone, as was so well shown by the late R. W. Seton-Watson, sympathised with the Slav schismatics, as did many Anglicans in

academic circles, while his information on Danubian affairs came mainly from his chief correspondent, Mgr Strossmayer, Archbishop of Zagreb, a strong opponent of the Bull of Infallibility at the Vatican Council of 1869, an 'Iraenic' Catholic with schismatic and Anglican sympathies, and thus a fervent Slavophile, despite his German origin and name. Lord Acton, echoing the conclusions Ranke formulated in '*Serbische Geschichte*,' represented the Hungarians of the Middle Ages as jealous of their Slav rivals and therefore responsible for breaking the unity of the Church by their 'narrow Romanism.' The pragmatic considerations which really explained the contemporary situation were thus obscured by this Liberal Anglican and Liberal Catholic view of Church history, as was also the more recent Anglo-Austrian effort to balance power in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Hence, Austria-Hungary had one ally only in her isolation, the Reich. As this became increasingly evident, all those national or political groups in the Hapsburg states which were hostile to Germanism became suspect and were treated as enemies of the state. In the early years of this century, the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister, Baron von Aehrenthal, made a last attempt to restore a free hand to the Monarchy. He negotiated a common programme with Russia on Balkan matters and hoped that British consent to the free passage of Russian ships through the Dardanelles would be attained through the mediation of Vienna. He fared, as we know, very badly. Instead of a British endorsement of the Austro-Russian rapprochement and of the 'free hand' to be gained for Austria-Hungary at the expense of Berlin, an outcry in England greeted Austria-Hungary's advance into the Balkans. Sir Edward Grey made an indignant protest. Thus Russia could not but regret the consent she had given to Aehrenthal when it became obvious that Austria had taken her prize, while Russia had lost hers, owing to British opposition. The remainder of the story is well known. It is one of fatality. Professional military sympathies for the Reich, represented by the chief of the Austrian General Staff, Conrad von Hoetzendorff, steered the Habsburg state ever more surely on to its fatal course. This version of the Habsburg state, in its final years, bore increasingly less resemblance to the European Austria of former days, the

Austria of Maria-Theresa, of Metternich, and even of Schwarzenberg and Beust. '*Je ne vois plus d'Europe,*' said Beust in 1870, when he found no government ready to act against Bismarck, and for some years this remained a *mot célèbre*.

Indeed a 'visible' Europe hardly existed any more on the eve of 1914. The disappearance of the Austrian power, and with it of a genuine Danubian civilisation, was the epilogue to the story. This tragedy has been so often deplored since 1919, particularly since the convulsions of the 1930s, that there is hardly any need to insist upon it; Sir Winston Churchill considers it to be a main cause of Hitler's rise to power and of the Second World War. The outstanding problem of the future, which is now our concern, is once more the creation of a central power between Russia and the West. An impartial survey of the past, made from the true perspective of the time, may not be without a certain usefulness in this connection.

BÉLA MENCZER.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

- Zacharias Werner: '*Briefe*,' Munich 1914; '*Tagebücher*,' Leipzig 1939.  
 H. Wahl: '*Prinz Louis Ferdinand von Preussen; Tagebücher und zeitgenössische Zeugnisse*,' Berlin 1925.  
 Baron Peter von Meyendorff: '*Ein russischer Diplomat an den Höfen von Wien und Berlin*,' Leipzig 1923.  
 F. von Gentz: '*Aus dem Nachlasse*,' Wien-Leipzig, 1867; '*Briefe*' (to Metternich, etc.), Leipzig 1913.  
 E. Heller: '*Der Vorkämpfer Mitteleuropas*' (i.e. Prince Felix Schwarzenberg), Vienna, 1935.  
 A. Schwarzenberg: '*Prince Felix Schwarzenberg*,' New York 1946.  
 Rudolf Kiszling: '*Prinze Felix Schwarzenberg*,' Graz 1952.  
 J. A. von Helfert: '*Revision des ungarischen Ausgleichs*,' Vienna 1876.  
 '*Memoirs of Friedrich Ferdinand, Count von Beust*,' London 1887.  
 Francis Deák: '*Collected Speeches, Letters and Documents*,' edited by Emmanuel Kónyi (in Hungarian), Budapest 1882-86.  
 Joseph Frhr. von Eötvös: '*Ungarn's Unabhängigkeit vom Standpunkte der deutschen Einheit*,' Leipzig 1861.  
 Zoltán Ferenczi: '*Life of Deák*' (in Hungarian), 1904; '*Life of Baron J. Eötvös*' (ditto), 1912.  
 E. von Wertheimer: '*Graf Julius Andrássy*,' Stuttgart 1910.  
 Emmanuel Kónyi: '*Beust and Andrássy*' (in Hungarian), 1898.  
 Albert Sorel: '*Histoire diplomatique de la guerre franco-allemande*,' Paris 1875.  
 Ernest Denis: '*La fondation de l'empire allemand*,' Paris 1924.  
 Jacques Bainville: '*Bismarck et la France*,' Paris 1907.  
 R. W. Seton-Watson: '*The Southern Slav Question and the Habsburg Monarchy*,' London, Constable, 1911; '*Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question*,' London, Macmillan, 1935.  
 A. F. Pribram: '*Austria-Hungary and Great Britain 1908-14*,' Oxford University Press, 1951.  
 A. J. P. Taylor: '*The Habsburg Monarchy*,' London, Hamish Hamilton, 1949.  
 Joseph Redlich: '*Die Schicksalsjahre Österreich's. Ein politisches Tagebuch*,' Graz-Köln 1953.

## Art. 11.—THOMAS GRAY.

1. *Thomas Gray, a Biography*. By R. W. Ketton-Cremer. Cambridge University Press, 1955. 25s.
2. *Correspondence of Thomas Gray*. Edited by the late Paget Toynbee and Leonard Whibley. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1935. 3 vols. 4l. 4s.
3. *Two Quiet Lives : Dorothy Osborne ; Thomas Gray*. By Lord David Cecil. Constable, 1948. 12s. 6d.
4. *The Poems of Gray and Collins*. Edited by Austin Lane Poole. (Oxford Standard Authors.) 1950. Oxford University Press, 1919 ; 3rd ed. 1937 ; 4th impression. And other works.

GRAY has been coming into his own. There can hardly be another poet or intellect of his stature whose output is so small. In the Oxford Standard Authors he only makes a volume by being combined with Collins. Yet to the comparatively small circle that knew him his vast learning and his poetical power were obvious. They have, since those days, been obvious to widening circles, thanks to his best editors and biographers ; the work of the latest and best is here under review.

His works, and most of all his letters, have followed an ascending scale of conscience and accuracy in their editors. Boswell was indeed uniquely accurate : but Mason, to whom Gray had left too free a hand, was careless beyond even the standard of his time. Then came T. J. Mathias, and after him Mitford. In the 1880's Edmund Gosse, *pas pour son bien*, wrote the very bad Life in 'English Men of Letters,' and followed it with an edition of the works and correspondence. In this last his greatly superior successor, Duncan Tovey, showed bitingly how Gosse had claimed to have transcribed from originals in the British Museum yet had strangely repeated all Mitford's errors ! It has been suggested that in 1931 the Hon. Evan Charteris first offered the true explanation that a dishonest amanuensis had preferred copying the printed text, and had so let Gosse down. The present writer well remembers giving the same explanation in 1912—an explanation obvious to anyone familiar with the variegated race of 'Readers,' some of whom he once defined as 'persons who have unfortunately been taught to read.'\*

---

\* Gosse's error was that he did not at once produce the explanation, which he could have done with small loss of face. In just the same way Cardinal

Now, with Lane Poole's 1919 edition of the 'Poems,' with Paget Toynbee and Leonard Whibley's of the 'Correspondence' (1935), and with Mr Ketton-Cremer's 'Biography,' based on foundations laid by Whibley and on the wealth of the Pembroke College Library, and following up his own admirable book on Horace Walpole, we may well believe that no more than chance scraps remain to be added to the Gray corpus—unless, indeed, his voluminous note-books are ever eviscerated.

One minor and technical improvement may be desiderated for the later editions which will assuredly follow, the inclusion in the page-headlines of the year under review and (to ease reference to and from Notes) the Chapter-number.

Gray was the most retiring and shy of men. Perhaps the only period of his life when he really came out of his shell was his time at Eton, when, though keeping aloof from the rude, disorderly mob of boys (many of them young enough to 'chase the rolling circle's speed,' in other words to bowl hoops), he formed with three others, a year his juniors, Walpole, West, and Ashton, the celebrated 'Quadruple Alliance.' These four roamed the lovely countryside, dreaming, imagining, botanising; Gray's uncle Antrobus, an Assistant Master, had introduced him to the study of botany, which fructified throughout life.

Countless distributors of school prizes have declared that their schooldays were the happiest time of their lives, a statement received with as much scepticism as the words 'it hurts me more than it hurts you.' But Gray could have said it with perfect truth; his 'Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College' is as sincere in its rosy picture of boyhood and gloomy view of later life, as it could be.

The boy's home in Cornhill was miserable. The only survivor of a large family, he had to watch his mother, to whom he was devoted, being abused, beaten, and nearly ruined by his detestable father, who luckily died fairly soon, though sooner had been better.

Happier days and scenes were to come, when Mrs Gray and her sister moved to Stoke Poges. There the youth was in sight (a distant prospect) of the scenes of his happy boyhood, and could roam and botanise and dream. The depth of his feeling as he sat under the ancient Burnham

---

Gasquet could have made all right with a still friendly Coulton. Both let their chance go by.

beeches may be inferred from his calling them in one of his letters of this time 'these reverend vegetables.'

But he had to qualify for a profession. The law, for which he had no inclination, was chosen, and he was entered at Peterhouse, Cambridge, to read for the LL.B. Walpole, who figured largely in Gray's life, followed him a year later to King's. Ashton is little more heard of, but the remaining member of the Quadruple Alliance, West, Gray's deeply loved Favonius, entered Christ Church, Oxford. He was already consumptive, and was to die in 1742, to his friend's grief and also to his first and almost his only burst of poetic afflatus. This produced the lovely sonnet ending :

'To warm their little loves the birds complain ;  
I fruitless mourn to him that cannot hear,  
And weep the more because I weep in vain.'

It also produced the famous 'Elegy.'

West was indeed a terrible loss ; his verses, English and Latin, if not important, had merit, and his letters show a sensitive and lovable nature. Gray never really recovered, though his affectionate nature sought substitutes in younger friends like Bonstetten. Of marriage he seems never to have had a thought.

The Cambridge of which the shy, refined poet was a denizen from 1734 for four years and again (after his Continental tour with Walpole) from 1742, was as distasteful to him as Oxford was to Gibbon :

'The Masters of Colledges are twelve grey haired Gentlefolks, who are all mad with Pride ; the Fellows are sleepy, drunken, dull, illiterate things ; the Fellow-Com[moners] are imitators of the Fellows, or else Beaux, or else nothing ; the Pension[ers] grave, formal Sots, who would be thought old ; or else drink Ale, & sing songs against y<sup>e</sup> Excise. The Sizars are Graziers Eldest sons, who come to get good Learning, that they may all be Archbishops of Canterbury.'

And these choice assemblies, or the senior ranks, sat all of every evening and far into the night guzzling, swilling, smoking strong tobacco (which Gray hated almost worse than the rest) and talking bawdy.

Young Gray very naturally made of his own rooms a refuge from this sort of society. There he had his books, a harpsichord, a window-garden, a bowl of pot-pourri, in the compounding of which he was as learned as in everything else. He read widely and deeply, and he filled not

only small pocket-books but large volumes with his notes.

His first period at Peterhouse lasted four years, after which he returned to London, and then accompanied Walpole on the celebrated tour of France and Italy. Much has been written about the quarrel between the two—a quarrel for which Walpole generously admitted his responsibility, but which was in fact inherent in the collocation of the gay son of the Prime Minister and the earnest student from Cornhill. The quarrel was later made up, and left no permanent mark. The most vital experience of the tour for Gray was the visit (a visit which he repeated on his solitary homeward journey) to the Grande Chartreuse. In a generation in which the sense of natural beauty, the sense of history, and the sense of religion were alike at a low ebb, all three were stimulated in the young English scholar, with whom they remained, ineradicable, for the rest of his life.

In 1742 he returned to Peterhouse as LL.B. and a Fellow-Commoner. In the unfinished and posthumously published 'Hymn to Ignorance,' written at this time, so reminiscent of the close of the 'Dunciad,' he saluted his Alma Mater thus :

' Hail, horrors, hail ! ye ever gloomy bowers,  
Ye gothic fanes, and antiquated towers,  
Where rushy Camus' slowly-winding flood  
Perpetual draws his humid train of mud . . . '

The old shrinking from the vulgar college crowd kept him a studious recluse ; he was physically delicate, with, it is believed, a disease of the kidneys, of which he died at the early age of fifty-five, and after fourteen years the drunkenness of his young staircase-neighbours and his morbidly exaggerated fear of fire led him to have fixed outside his window the celebrated and still visible fire escape, and when the College declined to take the affair seriously, to make the easy move across the road to Pembroke, where he already had several friends. There he spent the last and, since Eton, the happiest years of his life. With Pembroke he will always be identified ; there are his notebooks and other manuscripts, and there have been most of the most scholarly and thorough students of his life and work, from his young friend and first editor, Mason, by then Precentor at York, to the late Leonard Whibley, on whose foundations the definitive biography

before us has been built, and who with Paget Toynbee produced twenty years ago the equally definitive collection of Gray's 'Correspondence'; nor should we omit the present Master of Pembroke, Dr S. C. Roberts, who is no less a Johnsonian.

During his Pembroke years Gray spent much vacation time in travel. When the British Museum was opened, in 1759, he spent some months in the Reading Room there, transcribing from MSS. for Walpole's book. His letters on this are most entertaining; the childish quarrels of the Keepers struck him at once as exactly like those of the Fellows of a College.

Later he often toured England, particularly the North, visiting Mason at York and his other Pembroke friend Wharton in County Durham. One year he made his visit to the Lakes, and thereby founded the school of mountain lovers, Wordsworth included; whereas for Gilbert White the gentle South Downs were 'this horrific range of mountains.' We may trace the new attitude back to Gray's visits to the Grande Chartreuse. Jean-Jacques had, surely, nothing to do with it.

In his latter years at Peterhouse Gray had finished the 'Elegy' and had launched out into a new sort of poetry, the true Pindaric Ode; Cowley and Dryden had written so-called Pindarics, but they were loose imitations, based on the theory enunciated by (of all people) Horace, that the Odes of Pindar were 'lege solutos'; Gray's were exactly constructed. After his move to Pembroke he finished 'The Progress of Poetry' and (inspired by hearing Parry, a Welsh harper) the famous 'Bard.' These two Odes formed the first publication of Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill Press.

What struck contemporaries in these and in Gray's later Odes was the elaborate dignity of their diction and metre, as well as the profusion of historical and literary allusions. Putting on one side the 'Elegy', which, as Johnson said, gave words to what everyone had felt, and such pieces as the brilliantly witty, but surely heartless, poem on the watery end of Walpole's 'pensive Selima,' he was thought of as the stately poet, who, gathering his singing robes about him, chanted lines like

'Two Coursers of ethereal race,

With necks in thunder clothed, and long-resounding pace.'  
Long-resounding, indeed!

To some of us moderns he is not only the most delightful of letter-writers, but in flashes the tenderest of poets, the lover of whatever things are good, and also of the minutely observed beauties of nature, thus heading the roll of naturalist-poets which was to include Tennyson and Hopkins.

Thus, walking in the meadows one day with his young friend Norton Nicholls, he suddenly improvised the exquisite couplet

'There pipes the woodlark, and the song-thrush there  
Scatters his loose notes in the waste of air.'

What prodigality of genius not to have fitted that into a poem, and not to have completed the heavily entitled 'Ode on the Pleasure arising from Vicissitude,' in which he describes how the skylark

'Melts into air and liquid light,'

and how for the convalescent

'The meanest flowret of the vale,  
The simplest note that swells the gale,  
The common Sun, the air, and skies,  
To him are opening Paradise.'

The depth and tenderness of his heart are shown in many short pieces. The last lines of his epitaph on Mrs Clerke,

'Till time shall every grief remove,  
With life, with memory, and with love,'

are indeed pagan and Stoic, and do not represent Gray's religious nature; but the four lines on Mason's young wife, which he added to that very poor poet's effusion, and which end

'Heaven lifts its everlasting portals high,  
And bids the pure in heart behold their God.'

are as much the true inner Gray as the line

'Teach me to love and to forgive.'

One cannot love the good without hating the evil. Gray hated not only the grossness, drunkenness, and idleness of Cambridge; he hated even more deeply the servile crawling after great men for preferment to deaneries and bishoprics which was almost universal; and he hated Newcastle, the University's Chancellor, who played the game with a whole heart. Hurd somehow escaped Gray's

censure, but he openly wrote to Mason when the latter became Residentiary and Precentor at York that he had now filled his 'insatiable mouth.'

The lowest of these reptiles, who make that age of the Church of England stink in the nostrils of an age which has been formed by the Tractarians, was a certain Rev. Henry Etough, a quondam Dissenter whom Gray called Tophet :

'Such Tophet was : so looked the grinning fiend  
While frightened prelates bowed and called him friend . . .  
Hosannahs rang through Hell's tremendous borders,  
And Satan's self had thoughts of taking orders.'

Whigs to a man ; for that was the way just then to the Church's loaves and fishes, all they cared for. Gray was a Whig of a sort, but he was no politician, and had he ever joined in the anti-George III cry (even to-day not dead), which he never did, he would have been moved by the knowledge that it was George III's personal intervention and 'particular knowledge' which gave him the well-deserved, if sinecure, Regius Professorship of Modern History in 1768.

Johnson was notoriously a high Tory ; yet he said, not only that the Devil was the first Whig, but also that a wise Whig and a wise Tory would generally be found to agree. It was not faction which divided the two men ; it was want of knowledge. Gray's only known remark about Johnson (apart from some praise of 'London') was when he pointed him out in a London street to Bonstetten with the famous words 'there goes Ursa Major.' Johnson, on his side, admired the 'Elegy' indeed, but said of the Gray of the Odes, 'he has a kind of strutting dignity' and (later), 'he was dull in a new way, and that made many people think him great.' Gray's shrinking refinement and Johnson's surface 'anfractuosities' would have made intimacy difficult ; but there was no chance even of acquaintance, though the amiable W. J. Temple might have made a link through Boswell.

And so the two most learned heads and warmest hearts in England lived in an ignorant mutual antipathy. Johnsonians and Graians may mingle their tears at the thought.

ARUNDELL ESDAILE.

W. S. to Stratford, Conn. :

(On the inaugural performance of the American  
Shakespeare Festival Theatre : July 12, 1955)

Strange folk, who are ye ? Friends, I see ; but how ?  
I wrote in London plays that were performed  
In Southwark by the sweetly flowing Thames  
When Gloriana ruled, Elizabeth  
Our gracious Queen.—What's that ? She rules to-day ?  
But is she then immortal ? Has she stretched  
Dominion over Time and Ocean's width ?  
Ah, I can hear the groundlings' verdict yet,  
Or so it seems : I am immortal then,  
And she, the Queen Elizabeth, is still  
A sovereign regnant far beyond her realm.  
I thank you, sirs : I make my bow to you,  
Fair friends, nay, cousins, speaking this my tongue,  
Her tongue, that is, and playing my old plays.  
But what is Time ? Does Julius Cæsar care  
His fate was writ by me, is played by you  
In England and in this great, distant land ?  
There neither is mortality, it seems,  
Nor immortality—except through pen,  
Or brush, it may be : airy nothings live  
In splendour of a habitation's strength  
Within the mind and memories of Man.  
You do me honour : I am bound to you ;  
The Avon and the Housatonic blend,  
The ages meet in plenitude of power.  
I will return to Warwickshire in peace :  
There, here, and everywhere my drama lives ;  
And in Life's spirit must my strength endure.

GORELL.

## SOME RECENT BOOKS.

- Early Georgian, 1715-1760.** Edited by Christopher Hussey.
- The Carlton Club.** Sir Charles Petrie, Bt.
- The Holstein Memoirs.** Edited by Norman Rich and M. H. Fisher.
- A History of Red Tape.** Sir John Craig, K.C.V.O., C.B.
- Voices of the Past.** James and Janet Maclean Todd.
- Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth.** Dr Conyers Read.
- Sir Anthony Eden.** Alan Campbell-Johnson.
- My Several Worlds.** Pearl S. Buck.
- Mark Rutherford. A Biography of William Hale White.** Catherine Macdonald Maclean.
- Conflict without Malice.** Emanuel Shinwell, M.P.
- Matthew Arnold.** J. D. Jump.
- Livingstone in Africa.** Professor Jack Simmons.
- Elinor Glyn.** Anthony Glyn.
- Israel and Her Neighbours.** Norman Bentwich.
- The Private Diaries of Stendhal.** Edited and translated by Robert Sage.
- Autobiographies.** W. B. Yeats.
- The Selected Poetical Works of George Meredith.** Compiled by G. M. Trevelyan, O.M.
- The Great Experiment.** Frank Thistlethwaite.
- Modern Historians and the Study of History.** Sir F. M. Powicke.
- Franco of Spain.** S. F. A. Coles.

THE delightful and imposing volumes of 'English Homes' by the late H. Avray Tipping have long been out of print, and of late years much new material has been assembled or brought to light. The proprietors of 'Country Life' have therefore started a new series, 'English Country Houses' for which they deserve the gratitude of all lovers of our famous houses and their history. The first volume to be published is 'Early Georgian 1715-1760,' compiled, edited, and explained by Christopher Hussey, than whom no reader or student could wish for a better or more skilled guide and teacher. After a useful introduction, including some discussion of the Whig ideal, the various styles of the period, and a list of the chief architects of country houses, the book is divided into three parts, firstly Georgian Baroque, secondly Palladian, and thirdly 'Rococo's serpentine, intricate, and asymmetrical forms giving the Orders a romantic twist, betokening a search for things unaccounted for, a change from universal equipoise,' so characteristic of the Palladian style. Each part is illustrated with outstanding pictures of about a dozen of the most eminent or typical houses of the period, with a comprehensive description of their structure, their chief features, and their decoration. The whole makes a most valuable commentary on domestic architecture of the time, and how the houses have fared since their building, with Mr Hussey's

pertinent remark, 'many of the houses can no longer be regarded primarily as family homes in a continuing way of life: but they have come to be recognised as national and historic works of art. They are therefore reviewed with emphasis on the latter aspect.' There is, however, the advantage that readers, after studying Mr Hussey's descriptions, will be able to see many of the actual houses now open to the public, though in former days entered only by privileged acquaintance with the owners. If the remaining volumes of the series maintain, as they surely will, the high standard of this first one, they will be a notable and splendid record of what may be called the cream of this country's treasures of architecture and decoration. Fortunate indeed is the student or general reader who may have them in his own library—or in any library to which he has access. 'Country Life' is to be congratulated warmly on the production.

The Carlton Club is famous both politically and socially and has had such a notable past history that it well deserves Sir Charles Petrie's skilful and entertaining record '**The Carlton Club**' (Eyre & Spottiswoode). The Conservative Central Office has now taken the position of the Club as the recruiting centre for parliamentary candidates, and feeding arrangements in Parliament and the fact that so many members live further away have lessened the attraction of clubs as an agreeable way of leisurely passing the time. Sir Charles tells us of the foundation and early years of the club and the very important part which it played in politics. Then we are told of the running of the club in later Victorian and Edwardian times, changing customs, ever-increasing expenses and other problems. We are also told some amusing stories of troublesome and eccentric members and how they were (or were not) dealt with. Then we come to later years, the disastrous bombing of October 1940 and the subsequent move to the very dignified and suitable but considerably smaller building formerly occupied by 'Arthur's'—and that is likely to be the home of the club for many years yet. The frontispiece shows us the club in 1832 in Pall Mall, yet we are told on p. 41 that it was not built till 1835, and its previous home is given within a few pages as Carlton Terrace, Carlton Gardens, and Carlton House Terrace, which seems a lack of accuracy. However, small blemishes like this do not

really affect a most readable, interesting, and historically valuable record of men and events.

Friedrich von Holstein (1837-1909) has for so long been cast for the part of the evil genius of the German Foreign Office during the Bismarckian and post-Bismarckian era, and is so well fitted for it with his peculiarly unattractive and carping personality, that it would be difficult to white-wash him now. In *'The Holstein Memoirs,'* edited by Norman Rich and M. H. Fisher (Cambridge University Press), a truer picture is presented of him—but he is still remarkably unattractive. His memoirs might be entitled *'Diplomatic Acid,'* for even when Holstein means to praise, which is seldom, there is always an acid tang somewhere. Bismarck was his chief, and of him he writes, 'It was a psychological necessity for Bismarck to make his power felt by tormenting, harrying and ill-treating people. His pessimistic view of life, which had long since blighted every human pleasure, had left him with only one source of amusement . . . a constant orgy of scorn and abuse of mankind.' Contempt of truth was another of Bismarck's characteristics. Such criticism is typical of the whole memoirs, which are disappointing in that they are not connected history, but deal only with Holstein's not-infallible recollection of special incidents such as the war against Denmark in 1864, the Franco-Prussian War and its aftermath, Bismarck's Russian policy and his relations with Wilhelm II and the Kaiser's relations to politics. The editors have done their work with skill and thoroughness and the annotation is full, but it is not known how many other editors have had their turn in the past, whether Holstein himself or others later while the papers were in Nazi possession.

*'A History of Red Tape,'* by Sir John Craig, K.C.V.O., C.B., late Deputy Master and Comptroller of the Mint (Macdonald and Evans), deals with the origin and development of the Civil Service. The author begins with the question 'Who are Civil Servants?' and adopts for present-day purposes the Tomlin Commission definition of 'servants of the Crown, other than the holders of political or judicial office, who are employed in a civil capacity and whose remuneration is paid wholly and directly out of moneys voted by Parliament.' The author, however, takes the subject back long before that definition was applicable.

He deals with Norman, Plantagenet, and Tudor times, when the holders of high office, usually clerics (as laymen were not sufficiently educated till the time of Thomas Cromwell), were in practice the Civil Service. Then we are shown something of the history of individual offices: the Exchequer, the Treasury, the Admiralty, the War Office, the Post Office, the Privy Council departments. Then we come to the pre-Victorians and then to the Welfare departments. Sir John writes with the authority of long experience and specialised knowledge. The book is filled with detailed information, such as the curious fact that between the time of Elizabeth I and Elizabeth II the Civil Service has increased 1000 times and Government expenditure 20,000 times—but all this information is served up in most readable style.

'Voices of the Past' (Phoenix House) is an anthology of classical literature made by James and Janet Maclean Todd with the aim of giving, in a single volume, a panorama of the ancient writers from 800 B.C. to A.D. 500, and, incidentally, of the ancient world and the way it lived through them. In his Foreword Sir Maurice Bowra writes: 'A selection such as is here given from the vast array of their writings reveals their vivid approach to life, their concern with most of the issues that concern us to-day, their courage and their candour. Here we can see how well they could tell a story or advance an argument or deal with philosophical abstractions. We can also appreciate much of their art in shaping words to dramatic or imaginative purposes. . . . There is indeed a vast gulf of years between us and them and yet they are in many ways nearer to us than most other peoples.' The editors have ranged courageously in their use of translators. They have had no inhibitions about using the work of comparatively unknown people if they felt that the true spirit of the original had been caught. But they have also included many examples of standard translators. They have compiled a volume that every literary minded reader should have on his shelves, particularly if he has no classical training. In these 550 pages he has a classical library in which he can refresh and stimulate his mind with grandeur of thought and originality of idea and entertain himself with the old simplicities of love and the more humdrum of human affairs.

American incursions into English history should help to foster good relations between English-speaking peoples. But a citizen of a Republic does not easily comprehend absolute monarchy. The inversion of precedence in the title of Dr Conyers Read's '**Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth**' is significant. There are no footnotes; all references are in small type at the end. To keep turning to the end to ascertain the sources mars any pleasure in reading. Undertaken on a Guggenheim grant, this volume was accorded a 1000*l.* prize in America, where there seems to have been no consciousness that Dr Read's '*Left Wing*' and '*Right Wing*' are incongruous terms applied to an age essentially monarchical. The question was which monarch? Elizabeth, whom Pope Pius V pronounced only a pretended Queen, or Mary Queen of Scots? The Preface, with its claim to have explored Hatfield and Longleat, ignores the well-known fact that the essential documents from both collections were given (some in facsimile) in 1934 to 1953 in Tenison's ten volumes of '*Elizabethan England* ... "In Relation to all Foreign Princes."' Dr Read's '*Alva*' indicates that he has not studied the works in which from 1919 to 1953 the late Duke of Alba provided first-hand material as to that famous enemy of England. It is impossible to measure the resistance of England unless justice is done to '*the great Lion*,' as Cecil termed King Philip. Dr Read finds Cecil's memoranda '*tedious*.' Actually they give the key to vital issues, provided they are scrutinised with sufficient comprehension of the matters treated. So vast were the labours of this great Minister and so complicated the relations of England with foreign powers, that the ten volumes above-named have been necessary adequately to convey what Dr Read is struggling to squeeze into two.

'*Sir Anthony Eden*,' by Alan Campbell-Johnson (Robert Hale), might well be entitled '*Eden, M.P.*' because all his life before he was elected to Parliament is covered in 25 pages and the remainder of the book is just a well-told and factual record of his career as politician and statesman. No decent-minded person wants to pry into the private sorrows and joys of the subject of a biography, but no really true picture of a man can be painted when he is shown entirely in his work and public life. That is the defect of the present volume. It covers much of the now well-known

political history of the last 35 years, but that is necessary to show the part which Eden played and the way that he built up his present great reputation. Many will probably think that scant justice is done to Neville Chamberlain, but any stick is good enough to beat a man, or his reputation, when he is down. Duff Cooper (whom the author consistently wrongly hyphenates) was notorious in his bitter dislike of Chamberlain, as his book fully proves, and perhaps Mr Campbell-Johnson depends too much on his evidence, or even on the doubtful evidence of Count Grandi. However, taken all round, the book is a fair and well-reasoned description and assessment of the public career of a remarkably able, and strikingly upright man.

Very few people can write about China with the intimate knowledge and deep understanding of Pearl S. Buck, who spent nearly all her first forty years living in closest association with the people, from nursery age onwards. Her parents were Presbyterian missionaries who dedicated their lives to the work, yet, going to China only when they were adults, they perhaps never achieved the understanding of the people that Pearl S. Buck has. Her autobiography, **'My Several Worlds'** (Methuen), is a work of great interest. In a light framework, so to speak, of her present home in America she paints a series of pictures of Chinese life, customs, traditions, manners, and philosophy. She compares them with American life and, while remaining a very loyal American, she appreciates the deep and bitter feelings of the Chinese resulting from the prolonged and often sadly ruthless exploitation of the country by the Western nations. She watched the growth of nationalism and xenophobia, the struggles and hopeless mistakes of Chiang Kai-shek and his associates, the onward surge of Communism, the Japanese domination and final defeat, and the triumph of the present Communist régime. By 1934 she found that she could no longer live with any pleasure and satisfaction in China and she returned to the U.S.A. to make her home. She describes this home and her views of American life with its virtues and vices, with great insight. The book is most valuable, but the absence of chapter titles, headlines, and index are a very considerable handicap to the reader.

**'Mark Rutherford. A Biography of William Hale White,'** by Catherine Macdonald Maclean (Macdonald), is

a clear, well-balanced, well-documented, and reasoned (and some may think rather too lengthy) work on a remarkable man. William Hale White was the son of a Bedford bookseller, who afterwards became a popular and well-esteemed Principal Doorkeeper in the House of Commons. The family were bred in the strict and strait 'Bunyan Meeting' sect of nonconformity, and William Hale was sent to an independent college to train for the ministry. He was expelled thence, to his credit and honour, for refusing to comply with the cramping and narrow mechanical theology enforced there. He became a clerk at Somerset House and afterwards at the Admiralty, where he rose to be Assistant Director of Naval Contracts. Parallel with his official life he carried on his literary life as 'Mark Rutherford,' novelist and biographer. Of his novels it is claimed that 'they are to be numbered less among the world's great novels than amongst the classics of the literature of religion.' He was deeply religious and loved the Bible, but for many years attended no place of worship, as he found that he learned nothing there. He loved the open air and the sea, but was afflicted with periods of terrible hypochondriacal depression. He was happy and fortunate in his family circle, apart from the many years of ever more paralysing illness of his much-loved first wife. He was an efficient and trustworthy official, but deeply regretted that his life had not been 'more adventurous, complicated, interesting and less tame.' He was always earnest, with unflinching high principles, but seemingly deficient in the saving grace of humour, which would also have lightened his biography, which can be praised for its honest and discerning qualities.

No one reading Emanuel Shinwell's autobiography, '**Conflict without Malice**' (Odhams), can fail to admire the determination and pluck with which he surmounted the financial and inadequate education handicaps of his earlier years. He had the fixed ambition to win through to success in the Labour political world, and he has done so. His somewhat tempestuous years of agitation in Glasgow landed him in prison in one case—well, that was useful experience. His lack of means only encouraged harder work, and backed by his very real ability led him to a Privy Counsellorship and Cabinet office. The War Office seemed a strange place to send anyone of his background.

Mr Attlee sent him and he was a success, as also in the wider field of Minister of Defence. He is a skilful, experienced, and plentiful speechmaker, though sometimes his remarks are unwisely lacking in caution. He has much of interest to say of the many well-known people of all parties with whom he has come in contact, and does not hesitate to criticise even his own leaders. 'Conflict without malice'—yes, plenty of conflict but how about the malice? This is what he says of some Tory adversaries: 'their entire lack of interest in the national welfare if carping and malicious political criticism proved more to their liking'; or 'the Opposition took every opportunity to weaken their country in the international sphere by airing unfounded views.' Is that altogether lacking in malice? Such lapses mar what is in many ways a remarkable story.

'Matthew Arnold,' by J. D. Jump, is a very useful addition to Messrs Longman's 'Men and Books' series. It aims at being a reassessment of Arnold's importance as a poet and critic. The first third of the book deals with his life and character, the second third with him as a poet, and the end with him as a critic. We are shown his early life under the influence of his formidable and eminent father at Rugby and the somewhat overpowering pressure of earnest and urgent morality in a wicked world. From this pressure he reacted with a marked levity and apparent lack of seriousness, which surprised many people. But it was only the screen behind which he did much valuable hard work. Mr Jump rates Arnold higher in his prose than in his poetry, which he considers was too much marked by uncreative ruminations and academic exercises. However, it is fully admitted that he was a notable figure in both fields—a kindly man, sane, confident, urbane, fair-minded, experienced, and perceptive. Mr Jump paints an attractive and discerning picture.

The English Universities Press is publishing a most useful series of little books called 'Teach Yourself History' the general editor of which is Mr A. L. Rowse. The idea is 'There is no end to what we can learn from history, for it is co-terminous with life. Its special field is the life of man in society, and at every point we can learn vicariously from the experience of others.' An excellent volume 'Livingstone in Africa,' is contributed by Professor Jack Simmons, of University College, Leicester. Livingstone

'was recognised by his countrymen as someone unique : an explorer and a missionary, but also a geographer, a scientist, a humanitarian statesman. Perhaps it would be nearest the truth to say that with a simple intuition, those crowds knew him for what he was : a great and good man.' The author gives a clear and factual account of the famous journeys : Livingstone's aims, struggles, hardships, successes, failures, positive achievements and inspiration to others. Always there was the dreadful and powerful opposition of the slave trade. Livingstone did not live to see it abolished, but his life and work went far to achieve that great end. The story is told with balanced judgment and deep insight and it should appeal to very many.

'Elinor Glyn,' by Anthony Glyn (Hutchinson), is a clever and penetrating character study of a remarkable woman, written with both the intimate touch of relationship and the detached point of view of a careful observer—at times almost a pathologist. She had a curious and unfortunate early family life : what she needed was firm and sympathetic guidance ; what she got was a mixture of neglect and nagging. Her inherited character was always divided : on the one side, Scottish, romantic, warm, emotional, at times almost fey ; on the other side French *ancien régime*, cynical, worldly, disillusioned, melancholy, pessimistic. Her haughty bearing, her arrogance, and her intolerance must have repelled many, yet men were drawn to her like moths to a candle, and some of them, like Lords Curzon and Milner, were far from moth-like people. For the general public she became an almost legendary person, a red-haired, green-eyed Queen of Passion, who spent her day, it was supposed, reclining on tiger skins. But that was really far from the true picture ; she revelled in romantic love, pageantry, and the decorative. In her own unsuccessful marriage romantic love failed, and she was the least suitable wife for a sporting Essex squire, though when he brought ruin upon himself owing to extravagance, she laboured unceasingly at her writing to keep the home going. She was worldly and could be heartless ; on the other hand she could be a true friend. Mr Glyn has produced a remarkable and striking portrait—very suitably illustrated by the Laszlo sketch which is the frontispiece.

'Israel and Her Neighbours,' by Norman Bentwich, Professor of International Relations, Jerusalem University,

1932-1951 (Rider & Co.), well justifies its sub-title of 'A Short Historical Geography.' We are given a clear and useful account of the physical features of the country as well as of its peoples, Jewish, Arab, and others. It is a truism to say that in the small space of Palestine the ages meet more fully than anywhere else on earth, prehistoric, ancient, mediæval, and modern, and it is equally obvious that no country has more religious significance, Jewish, Christian, and Moslem. It is a wonderful country for the archæologists, and within the space available Professor Bentwich makes good use of this. He gives an excellent account of the Jews and Arabs in history, Palestine east and west of Jordan and its many problems to-day. He tells of Jerusalem, the coastal towns, Galilee, Samaria, the Negev, the Dead Sea and Jericho, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, and Syria and the Lebanon—in fact, in every way it is a very good book for all who are interested in the Holy Land and that should be the large majority of intelligent readers.

'Milan, April 18th, 1801. I am undertaking to write the history of my life day to day. I don't know whether I will have the fortitude to carry out this plan which I already started in Paris. There's a mistake in French already: there will be a lot more because I am making it a rule not to stand on ceremony and never to erase.' So runs the first entry in '**The Private Diaries of Stendhal**' (Gollancz), edited and translated by Robert Sage. Stendhal's reputation as a novelist is as high as it has ever been, and this invaluable book provides the key to the perfection he attained in '*Le Rouge et Noir*' and '*La Chartreuse de Parme*.' It is a constant reminder of the scale he envisaged necessary for him fully to express his genius. It is a continual exercise in self-knowledge working towards the condition when the complete writer had reached full stature through success both as a lover and as a man in society. His self-analysis is quite astounding. One is a little disdainful, often, of the complete egotism that so much of his diary seems to indicate and then suddenly the Stendhal of the novels protrudes and one is again staggered at the genius of the man. Once having formulated his plan, he followed it out with a seriousness and a devotion quite unparalleled. He kept his diary for fourteen years, and apart from its importance as a key

to Stendhal it also serves as a particularised background to the Napoleonic era. Mr Sage has edited the Diaries very efficiently, breaking them up into thirteen sections each of which is preceded by a biographical introduction, thus keeping the reader up to date both as to time and to place. Stendhal is a writer of passion at the highest level and had no pretensions whatsoever about abstract proprieties. He aimed that every minute of his day should have significance and his scrutiny of himself in detail is an astonishing revelation of his sensibility.

From Stendhal to W. B. Yeats is a far cry. But Yeats was equally devoted to his chosen profession as a writer and as a poet and accepted professionally the great personal toil involved in achieving this, as did Stendhal. But how different they were as men: Stendhal, insatiable for emotional experience and the prestige of his ego; Yeats seeing the intellect as an instrument of the heart and coming to his great achievement by that means. His 'Autobiographies,' now issued in one volume (Macmillan), is one of the most profound and tender books of our time. Here again is that absolute candour which is such a feature of the Stendhal Diaries. But here it is mainly concerned with the impression of life on Yeats and there is a great intimacy between the reader and Yeats—but he was writing for an audience. There is a natural nobility about Yeats which impresses more and more as the common quibbles about him quieten. When he finally stands alone in his work and there are no more personal memories to dress him up in false hats, there can be no question of his greatness. Here again is a book that any young writer must read to understand the meaning of dedication. It is not a text-book on how to be a writer, because there could only ever be one Yeats, but it reveals in every thought of that rich, charitable, inquiring and appreciative mind how applied the writer's life should be and how important it is to conceive it as a whole and not as an annexe to the job of living. Like Stendhal, Yeats was very much involved in the affairs of his day and with him also they became the substance of some of the most notable and indestructible expressions of his genius.

Poetic reputation sometimes seems an arbitrary thing. But all poetry that carries its author's personality

unabashed—if it is on sufficient scale and once the controversy of fashion has dropped from it—is marvellously capable of yielding something new at every re-reading. Anyone coming fresh to '**The Selected Poetical Works of George Meredith**,' compiled with notes by G. M. Trevelyan (Longmans, Green), is immediately in touch with this living individuality of voice. Meredith's few popular pieces are a small part of an impressive range of narrative poetry that not only tells a story but does it with an exciting accomplishment of technique and poetic awareness. Meredith has, perhaps, not the imaginative originality that transfigures literature, but he used his poetry to express deeply felt ideas and uncluttered honesty of thought. He saw poetry as a glad power of illuminating people—fully aware that the poet has means more subtle and compressed than has the novelist. This selection amply shows how his work goes straight into the modern consciousness. It has the poetic realism so fully developed by Yeats. Meredith was concerned with the human predicament and never with mere poetics. He wrote with the candour of his own experience. If he does not equal Hardy in the acuteness of his human situations he is fully his equal in clothing his themes with the overtones of feeling and precipitated action that the chemistry of men and women bring on themselves for better or for worse. But he has a joyousness and an inner spring of mortal faith. Professor Trevelyan's notes to the poems are invaluable.

There are very few general books on the history of the United States of America that will give the serious British student a proper introduction to the history of the American people. Frank Thistlethwaite wrote '**The Great Experiment**' (C.U.P.) with this in mind, and he has produced a remarkably clear study of an intensive civilisation that has been founded and developed into one of the major world forces in a little over three hundred years. But the author has remarkable power of compression and an eye for the main details which illuminate the whole and put it into perspective. British readers will be particularly grateful for these qualities, for in the main American history to us consists of a few salient facts stemming from a family quarrel. Mr Thistlethwaite points out that the rupture with Britain was not the cause but merely the symptom, and that always in the American mind is the

revolutionary idea, the independence both of the nation and the individual. It is this that enables the U.S.A. to keep up with its own pace. It accepts a fast tempo of change, and unless one sees this as a fundamental thing in the American character, one is not likely to understand either them or the pattern of their history very well. At the end of his splendid and valuable book Mr Thistlethwaite poses an important problem: 'Are the American people temperamentally given to dynamic experiments, to impatient and Utopian solutions, capable of the nerve discipline and experience demanded of a great power . . . above all, are Americans determined merely to cherish their ideal at home at the risk of losing it altogether or are they prepared to project it abroad in the hope of establishing some form of framework in which a free world may survive?' This book perhaps shows the way they may take.

'Modern Historians and the Study of History,' by F. M. Powicke (Odhams), unless one is prepared for its wholly academic flavour, seems an odd work in that it creates an esoteric atmosphere around itself without in any way meaning to. It is in two parts, the first being the author's personal recollections of scholars, in which he discusses quite objectively their merits both as historians and men. The second part deals with the general trends of contemporary historical study and the schools of thought that have gone to make it. Sir Maurice's scrupulous impartiality will strike the general reader as uneventful. The short biographical sketches will certainly have a mild value as a source of reference because of their direct acquaintanceship with their subjects, but they are so circumspect that one reflects that when the scales of justice are equally filled the whole judiciary dozes. On the other hand, it may be that because we have all become affected with the denigratory trend of the modern biographer these reticent, meticulously mannered sketches seem to have much of the quality of the polite obituary. The second section has far more flavour. Sir Maurice is involved in these subjects as an active professional and therefore has both original opinions and those garnered from long practice and experience, and any student of history will find much valuable guidance provided. It is of course only fair to state that the author obviously had an academic audience in mind throughout the book. Indeed, most of

THE  
QUARTERLY  
REVIEW

VOL. 293.

COMPRISING Nos. 603, 604, 605, 606.

PUBLISHED IN  
JANUARY, APRIL, JULY & OCTOBER,  
1955.

LONDON:  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.  
1955

THE  
QUARTERLY  
REVIEW

Vol. 105  
CONTENTS: Vol. 105, No. 402  
PUBLISHED IN  
JANUARY, APRIL, JULY & OCTOBER  
1928

Made and Printed in Great Britain by WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, Limited,  
London and Beccles, and published by JOHN MURRAY (Publishers) Limited.

the chapters were written for academic journals and for these readers the professional detail will have an importance that it cannot have for the general public, who wants to see the machines and not the men who tend them.

'**Franco of Spain,**' by S. F. A. Coles (Spearman) is a good and scholarly book by a learned press correspondent and author, who understands the soul of Spain and knows her people and languages—features that are sadly lacking in many recent books about Spain, which so often paint inaccurate or stage-property pictures. This book is well documented and carries conviction and respect. Besides being a biography of General Franco, it is also a correct contemporary history of modern Spain, covering the much-disputed ground of the revolution, communist penetration, civil war, persecution by the U.N.O., and finally the entrance of Spain into Western defence; it should be read by all who are interested in the problems of European defence, Gibraltar, and the monarchy. It may not be a popular book, for it is still fashionable for the uninstructed public to rely on authors who have little care for history, much prejudice, and only touristical knowledge and who repeat the old clichés and slogans of left-wing propaganda that in the past hoodwinked the world and the Labour Party. The book will receive greater credence because, like Balaam, Mr Coles was predisposed to curse and was converted to his conclusions by the evidence and by the results achieved in Spain in fifteen years of peace, order, and security greater than any known for centuries in that very individualistic and turbulent country. Mr Coles depicts General Franco not only as a brilliant soldier and a God-fearing one, but as a great leader, patriot, and statesman; he was the only European statesman who was capable of successfully defying Hitler, and his tenacity and equanimity have enabled Spain to weather international persecution and to reach the point to-day when she has become a necessity to Western defence against communism. Mr Coles records the accuracy of General Franco's vision and statements regarding the state of Europe after the war in striking contrast with that of our own statesmen and diplomats.

# INDEX

TO THE

## TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-THIRD VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.]

### A.

- Abel, Deryck*, 'British Conservatives and State Ownership,' 113-125.  
*Abetz, Otto*, 381, 383.  
*Alanbrooke, Field-Marshal*, 1st Viscount, 49.  
*Alba, Duke of Berwick and*, 457, 458.  
*Albert I, King of the Belgians*, 400.  
*Alderson, Stanley*, 'Prescription for Democracy,' 165-173.  
*Alexandra, H.M. Queen*, 408.  
*Alibert, Raphael*, 380, 385.  
*Allen, Sir Carleton*, 'Law and Disorders,' 272-273.  
*Allen, Walter*, 'The English Novel,' 186-187.  
*Arnold, J. C.*, 'Rights and Obligations of Company Directors,' 332-345.  
*Aron, Robert*, 378, 379, 380.  
*Attlee, Rt Hon. Clement*, 114.  
*Auriol, President*, 165, Note.

### B.

- Badoglio, Marshal*, 162.  
*Barker, Sir Ernest*, 149.  
*Barlow, Frank*, 'The Feudal Kingdom of England, 1042-1216,' 271.  
*Barnhart, Clarence L.*, 'New Cyclopedia of Names,' 126-127.  
*Baron, Sir William*, 'India, North and South,' 309-319.  
*Battifol, Mgr*, 229, 230.  
*Baudouin, Paul*, 381, 382.  
*Belgion, Montgomery*, 'Dead End at Vichy,' 377-386.  
*Benigni, Mgr Umberto*, 229.  
*Bentwich, Professor Norman*, 'Turkey after Thirty Years of the Revolution,' 346-351; 'Israel and Her Neighbours,' 556-557.  
*Bessborough, Earl of*, 'Georgiana. Extracts from the Correspondence of Georgiana Duchess of Devonshire,' 413-414.  
*Bevin, Rt Hon. Ernest*, 353.  
*Birka, Ghanshyam Das*, 387, 388, 398.  
*Bismarck, Prince von*, 298.  
*Blondel, Maurice*, 223.  
*Boncour, Paul*, 17.  
*Bond, R. C.*, 321.  
*Boswell, James*, 69, 70, 72.  
*Bouthillier, M.*, 381.  
*Bridges, Asa*, 'Victorian People,' 274-275.  
*British Birds of Prey*, 89-99.  
*British Conservatives and State Ownership*, 113-125.

- British Railways and their Future, The*, 320-331.  
*Brockwell, Maurice W.*, 'The Van Eyck Problem,' 277.  
*Brooks, E. St John*, 'Sir Hans Sloane, the Great Collector, and His Circle,' 131.  
*Brown, R. Douglas*, 'The Battle of Criche! Down,' 417.  
*Bruce, Sir Michael*, 'Tramp Royal,' 133.  
*Buck, Pearl S.*, 'My Several Worlds,' 553.  
*Butler, Professor J. R. M.*, 44, 47.  
*Butler, Lt.-Col., P. R.*, 'Rivers of New England Poets,' 100-112.  
*Butler, Rt Hon. R. A.*, 12, 115, 286, 289.  
*Byron, Lord*, 496, 498-503.  
*Byron and the Stage*, 496-503.

### C.

- Cambon, M. Jules*, 303, 304.  
*Campbell-Johnson, Alan*, 'Sir Anthony Eden,' 552-553.  
*Chamberlain, Rt Hon. Neville*, 161, 301.  
*Charles-Roux, Françoise*, 381.  
*Churchill, Rt Hon. Sir Winston S.*, 12, 28, 46, 211, 353, 355, 356, Note, 358, 400, 457, 458, 539.  
*Ciano, Count*, 163 and Note, 452.  
*Cohen, Victor*, 'Lamennais,' 512-525.  
*Continental Policy of President Peron, The*, 192-205.  
*Coles, F. A.*, 'Franco of Spain,' 561.  
*Coty, M.*, 172.  
*Court, Professor W. H. B.*, 'A Concise Economic History of Britain,' 129.  
*Craig, Sir John*, 'A History of Red Tape,' 550-551.  
*Craigie, Sir William*, 155.  
*Cripps, Rt Hon. Sir Stafford*, 114.  
*Cronon, Edmund David*, 'Black Moses: the Story of Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association,' 424.  
*Cunningham, Admiral of the Fleet Sir John*, 46, 47.  
*Curzon, 1st Marquess*, 155.

### D.

- Dalton, Rt Hon. Hugh*, 115.  
*Daniel, Hawthorne*, 'The Inexhaustible Sea,' 423.  
*Darlan, Admiral*, 383.  
*Dead-End at Vichy*, 377-386.  
*Dead Reckoning for the Ship of State*, 439-450.

- Dean Milman and the *Quarterly Review*, 30-43.  
 Degrelle, Léon, 379.  
 Delcassé, M., 17.  
 Derry, T. K., 'The Jubilee of the Norwegian Monarchy,' 399-411.  
 Development of the English Theatre, The, 174-182.  
 De Voto, Bernard, 'The Journals of Lewis and Clark,' 276-277.  
 Dill, Field-Marshal Sir John, 47.  
 Doriot, Jacques, 379.  
 Doubts about the Welfare State, 281-294.  
 Dulles, John Foster, Secretary of State, U.S.A., 430, 431.

E.

- Economics of the Gangster, The, 243-256.  
 Eden, Rt Hon. Sir Anthony, 6, 20, 23, 46, 47, 358, 458.  
 Educational Crisis in America, The, 257-269.  
 Edward VII, King, 399, 400, 409, 410.  
 Edwards, Ralph, 'Early Conversation Pictures from the Middle Ages to about 1730,' 270.  
 Eisenhower, President Dwight, 172, 357, 358, 367, 425, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 438.  
 Eliot, Dr T. S., 141, 142, 143.  
 Ellis, Major L. F., 48, 49, 50.  
 Elwin, Whitwell, 464, 471-473, 474 Note, 475, 476.  
 Esdaile, Arundell, 'Thomas Gray,' 540-546.  
 Estenssoro, Señor Paz, 203.  
 Ethiopia, Haile Selassie I, Emperor of, 48.  
 Europa Publications, 'The Middle East: a Survey and Directory of the Countries of the Middle East,' 276.

F.

- Fabre-Luce, Alfred, 384.  
 Fisher, Dr H. A. L., 212 and Note.  
 Fisher, M. H., 'The Holstein Memoirs,' 550.  
 FitzGerald, Brian, 'Correspondence of Emily Duchess of Leinster,' Vol. II; 'Letters of Lord Edward FitzGerald and Lady Sarah Napier,' 420-421.  
 France Ungoverned, 14-29.  
 Franco, General, 452, 454, 455, 458-461.  
 Fuller, Major-General J. F. C., 'The Decisive Battles of the Western World and their Influence upon History,' 414-415.  
 Fullerton, Lady Georgiana, 477, 480-482, 485.

G.

- Gamelin, General, 385.  
 Gandhi, Mahatma, 316, 317.  
 Gaulle, General de, 26, 377, 383, 385.  
 Geiringer, Karl, 'The Bach Family,' 278-279.  
 George VI, H.M. King, 410.  
 Germany, Austria and Central Europe: A Historical Retrospect, 526-539.  
 Gladstone, as a 'Quarterly Review' Contributor, 464-476.

- Gladstone, Rt Hon. W. E., 281, 232, 464, 465, 466 and Note, 467 and Note, 468, 469, 471, 473.  
 Glyn, Anthony, 'Elinor Glyn,' 556.  
 Godden, Rumer, 'Hans Christian Andersen,' 422-423.  
 Gordon, D. St Leger, 'British Birds of Prey,' 89-99; 'Under Dartmoor Hills,' 130-131.  
 Gorell, Lord, 'He walked in Light,' 127; 'W.S.C.: April 5, 1955,' 425; 'W.S. to Stratford, Conn.,' 547.  
 Gort, Field-Marshal, 6th Viscount, 49.  
 Graham, Brigadier Lord Malise, 'The Middle East and France, 1939-40: The Official War History,' 44-51.  
 Grandi, Count, 162.  
 Grant, General Ulysses S., 425, 433.  
 Gray, Thomas, 540-546.  
 Greene, Marc T., 'The Educational Crisis in America,' 257-269.  
 Greg, W. W., 'The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History,' 424-425.  
 Grey of Falloden, Viscount, 296.  
 Gustav Adolf, King, of Sweden, 400.

H.

- Haakon VI, King, of Norway, 399.  
 Haakon VII, King, of Norway, 399-401, 403, 405, 408-411.  
 Hamilton, Robert, 'Our Language,' 183-191.  
 Hardy, Thomas, 209, 211.  
 Harnack, Dr Adolf, 224, 225.  
 Harriman, Averell, 434.  
 Heber, Reginald, 31-33.  
 Herrligkoffer, Karl, 'Nanga Parbat,' 279.  
 Hitler, Adolf, 47, 50, 157, 158 and Note, 257, 258, 296, 301, 380, 381, 383, 384.  
 Hobsbaum, E. J., 'The Economics of the Gangster,' 243-245; 248, Note.  
 Holland, E. Milner, 339.  
 Hope-Scott, James, 470, 471.  
 Hopkins, Kenneth, 'The Poets Laureate,' 277-278.  
 Hügel, Baron Friedrich von, 227, and Note 228.  
 Hughes, Cledwyn, 'West with the Tinkers,' 137-138.  
 Humphrey, George, Secretary of the Treasury, U.S.A., 434.  
 Huxley, Aldous, 412, Note, 450.  
 Huxley, Mrs Elspeth, 441.  
 Huxley, Julian, 439.  
 Hussey, Christopher, 'Early Georgian, 1715-1760,' 548-549.  
 Hydari, Sir Akbar, 392.

I.

- Ibanez, General, 196-200, 204.  
 Ibarra, Dr José Velasco, 204.  
 India, North and South, 309-319.  
 Industrial Revival in Wales, 232-242.  
 'International Who's Who,' 134.  
 Ismail, Sir Mirza, 390, 392.

## J.

- Johnson, Dr Charles S., 371.  
 Jones, Ernest, 'Essays in Applied Psychoanalysis,' Vol. I., 171, Note.  
 Jones, Inigo, 175, 176.  
 Juan Carlos, Prince, 459.  
 Jubilee of the Norwegian Monarchy, The, 399-411.  
 Jump, J. D., 'Matthew Arnold,' 555.

## K.

- Kames, Lord, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70.  
 Kefauver, Senator, 430, 434.  
 Kennedy, Captain A. L., 'Rise and Fall of Mussolini, The,' 150-164.  
 Kennedy, James, 470.  
 Kermod, Frank, 'The Tempest,' 131-132.  
 Kilmuir, 1st Viscount, 290.  
 Kitchener, Field-Marshal Earl, 50.  
 Knowland, Senator, 427.  
 Koenig, General, 378.  
 Kotelawala, Sir John, 316.  
 Kysant, Lord, 333, 334, 335, 336, 338.

## L.

- Lack, Dr and Mrs, 486, 487, 490 Note.  
 Lagrange, Père, 230.  
 Lamennais, F. R. de, 512-525.  
 Lansdowne, 5th Marquess of, 296.  
 Laski, Professor Harold, 113.  
 Laval, Paul, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 386.  
 Leaf, Walter, 208, 209 and Note.  
 Leahy, Admiral, 386.  
 Leakey, Dr L. S. B., 'Defeating Mau Mau,' 272.  
 Leather, E. H. C., 448.  
 Lee, Sir Sidney, 399.  
 Lennox-Boyd, Rt Hon. A. T., 116.  
 Lindsay, Michael (Lord Lindsay of Birker), 'China and the Cold War,' 419-420.  
 Linlithgow, 2nd Marquess of, 388, 389, 396.  
 Lippmann, Walter, 430.  
 Llewelyn, Michael Gareth, 'Industrial Revival in Wales,' 232-242.  
 Lloyd, Selwyn, 361.  
 Lloyd, Rev. Canon Roger, 'British Railways and their Future, The,' 320-331.  
 Lockhead, Marion, 'Parliament House and the Lords of Session,' 62-74; 'Two Minor Victorian Novelists; Lady Georgiana Fullerton and Mrs Norton,' 477-485.  
 Lockhart, John Gibson, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, Note, 38, 39, 464, 465, 467, 469, 470.  
 Lockhart, Mrs, 35, 36, 38.  
 Loisy, A. F., 221, Note, 223, 224, 225 and Note, 226, 227.  
 Longmore, Air Chief Marshal Sir Arthur, 48.  
 Lothian, Sir Arthur, 'Sidelight on Indian Federation,' 387-398.  
 Loveday, Arthur F., 'Spain: the Loss of a Friend,' 451-463.  
 Luke, Sir Harry, 'The Old Turkey and the New,' 415-416.  
 Lumby, E. W. R., 389.

## M.

- Macaulay, Lord, 41, 42.  
 Macdonald, N. P., 'The Continental Policy of President Peron,' 192-205.  
 MacGregor, Geddes, 'From a Christian Ghetto: Letters of Ghostly Wit written A.D. 2453,' 132-133.  
 Mackenzie, J. M. D., 491.  
 Maclean, Catherine Macdonald, 'Mark Rutherford: A Biography of William Hale White,' 553-554.  
 Macmillan, Rt Hon. Harold, 4, 113.  
 Madison, James, 426.  
 Magnus, Sir Philip, 464.  
 Maisky, M., 300.  
 Marcel, Gabriel, 219.  
 Maritain, Jacques, 319.  
 Matthew, Dr, 189.  
 Maud, Queen, of Norway, 399.  
 Maurois, André, 'Alexandre Dumas,' 422.  
 Maurras, Charles, 379.  
 McCarthy, Senator, 428, 429.  
 Menczer, Béla, 'Germany, Austria and Central Europe: A Historical Retrospect,' 526-539.  
 Mendès-France, Pierre, 15 and Note, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.  
 Middle East and France, 1939-40: The Official War History, The, 44-51.  
 Mignot, Mgr, 230.  
 Milman, Dean, 30-36, 37 and Note, 38-43.  
 Minney, R. J., 'Viscount Southwood,' 139-140.  
 Minot, Francis, 'The Inexhaustible Sea,' 423.  
 Mitchell-Hedges, F. A., 'Danger my Ally,' 274.  
 Modern School, The, 52-61.  
 Molotov, M., 356.  
 Monboddo, Lord, 70-74.  
 Morgan, Charles, 449.  
 Morris, Sir Charles, 290.  
 Morrison, Rt Hon. Herbert, 114, 118.  
 Morton, H. V., 'A Stranger in Spain,' 275-276.  
 Mullins, Claud, 'Doubts about the Welfare State,' 281-294.  
 Murray, John, III, 30, 32 and Note, 33-36, 37 Note, 39, 472, 474.  
 Mussolini, Benito, 46, 150, 151 and Note, 153-160, 162-164.  
 Myrdal, Professor, 370.

## N.

- Nawanagar, Maharajah of, 392.  
 Nehru, Pundit, 311, 313, 314, 316, 318, 319.  
 Newman, Cardinal, 34, 223, 224, 465.  
 Nicolson, Hon. Sir Harold, 155, 295.  
 Nicholson, Norman, 'The Lakers. The Adventures of the First Tourists,' 273.  
 Norton, Caroline, 477-480, 485.  
 Notestein, Wallace, 'The English People on the Eve of Colonization, 1603-1690,' 418-419.  
 Nowell, James, 'The Modern School,' 52-61.

O.

- O'Connor, General Sir R. N., 44.  
Oscar II, King of Sweden-Norway, 405, 406, 408.  
**Our Language**, 183-191.  
Owen, Frank, 'Tempestuous Journey ; Lloyd George, his Life and Times,' 138-139.

P.

- Papagos, General, 47.  
Parker, Eric, 492.  
Parker, W. M., 'Dean Milman and the Quarterly Review,' 30-43 ; 'Professor Toynbee's "Magnum Opus",' 206-217 ; 'Gladstone as a "Quarterly Review" Contributor,' 484-476.  
**Parliament House and the Lords of Session**, 62-74.  
Partridge, Eric, 184 and Note, 187, 190, 191.  
Percy of Newcastle, Lord, 'The Heresy of Democracy,' 129-130.  
Peron, President, 192-201, 203, 204.  
Pétain, Marshal, 282-285, 377, 378, 380, 381.  
Petrie, Sir Charles, 'Life and Letters of Sir Austen Chamberlain,' 165, Note ; 'The Place of the Professional in Modern Diplomacy,' 295-308 ; 'The Carlton Club,' 549-560.  
Petrie, Sir Flinders, 449.  
Pickles, Dorothy, 172, Note, 'France, the Fourth Republic,' 418.  
Pinay, Antoine, 17, 21.  
**Place of the Professional in Modern Diplomacy, The**, 295-308.  
Playfair, Major-General, I. S. O., 44.  
Platt, General, 47.  
Pollock, Sir John, 'France Ungoverned,' 14-29.  
Potter, Professor Simeon, 184-187, 188 and Note, 189, 191.  
Powieke, F. M., 'Modern Historians and the Study of History,' 560-561.  
**Prescription for Democracy**, 165-173.  
Priestley, J. B., 450.  
**Professor Toynbee's 'Magnum Opus'**, 206-217.  
**Public Libraries and Culture**, 141-149.

R.

- Race Relations and the Law in the United States**, 363-376.  
Rana, Maharajah, of Dholpur, 392.  
Rattray, Dr R. F., 'The Development of the English Theatre,' 174-182 ; 'Dead Reckoning for the Ship of State,' 439-450.  
Read, Dr Conyers, 'Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth,' 552.  
Reardon, Rev. B. M. G., 'Roman Catholic Modernism: A Retrospect,' 218-231.  
Reid, Sir Charles, 117.  
Reid, L. H., 'The Web of Life,' 504-511.  
Rich, Norman, 'The Holstein Memoirs,' 550.  
**Rights and Obligations of Company Directors**, 332-345.  
**Rise and Fall of Mussolini, The**, 150-164.  
**Rivers of New England Poets**, 100-112.

- Rivière, Père Jean, 221, Note.  
Robertson, General Sir Brian, 321, 322, 327, 328.  
Rocque, Colonel de la, 379.  
**Roman Catholic Modernism: A Retrospect**, 218-231.  
Rooke, Sir George, 456, 457.  
Roosevelt, President Franklin, 359, 426, 428, 438.  
Rose, A. G., 'Five Hundred Borstal Boys,' 133-134.  
Ruiseñada, Count of, 459.  
Runciman, Hon. Steven, 'The Kingdom of Acre,' 134-135.

S.

- Sage, Robert, 'The Private Diaries of Stendhal,' 557-558.  
Salisbury, 3rd Marquess of, 296.  
Sampson, R. V., 'Race Relations and the Law in the United States,' 363-376.  
Samuel, 1st Viscount, 115.  
Schuman, Robert, 17, 21, 22.  
Scott, Noel, 'Byron and the Stage,' 496-503.  
Scott, Sir Walter, 31, 35, 36.  
Sermoneta Vittoria, Duchess of, 154, 160.  
Shakespeare, William, 174, 175, 183.  
Shaw, George Bernard, 441.  
Shawcross, Rt Hon. Sir Hartley, 11.  
Shinwell, Rt Hon. Emanuel, 'Conflict without Malice,' 554-555.  
**Sidelight on Indian Federation**, 387-398.  
Simmons, Professor Jack, 'Livingstone in Africa,' 555-556.  
Simon, 1st Viscount, 430.  
**Situation in the United States, The**, 425-438.  
Slessor, Sir John, 353.  
**Some Recent Books**, 126-140 ; 270-280 ; 412-424 ; 548-561.  
Somervell, D. C., 217.  
Somerville, Admiral, 45.  
*Soulbury, Viscount*, 'Public Libraries and Culture,' 141-149.  
Spaight, J. M., 'The Super-Weapon Age,' 352-362.  
**Spain: the Loss of a Friend**, 451-463.  
Sraramilu, M., 313.  
Stanley, Dean, 34, 38, 41, 43 and Note.  
Stanley, Rt Hon. Oliver, 119.  
Stevenson, Adlai, 428, 433, 434.  
*Stevenson, J. A.*, 'The Situation in the United States,' 425-438.  
Strang, Lord, and other Members of the Foreign Office, 'The Foreign Office,' 416-417.  
Stroessner, General Alfredo, 201.  
Stuart, Dorothy Margaret, 'Dearest Bess. The Life and Times of Lady Elizabeth Foster, afterwards Duchess of Devonshire,' 413-414.  
**Super-Weapon Age, The**, 352-362.  
Sweden, Margaret, Crown Princess of, 400.

T.

- Taft, Senator, 427, 433.  
Tedder, Marshal of the R.A.F. Lord, 51.

- Templewood, 1st Viscount, 'Nine Troubled Years,' 127-129, 289, 290, 388, 396, 398, 458.
- Third Year of Conservative Government, The,** 1-15.
- Thistlethwaite, Frank, 'The Great Experiment,' 559-560.
- Thomas Gray, 540-546.
- Thompson, Dorothy, 430.
- Tibawi, A. L., 'Western Technology and the Arab World,' 75-83.
- Tilden, Philip, 'True Remembrances,' 273-274.
- Tillotson, Professor Geoffrey, 'Thackeray: the Novelist,' 137.
- Todd, James and Janet Maclean, 'Voices of the Past,' 551.
- Toynbee, Professor Arnold J., 206 and Note, 207-217, 405.
- Tredrey, F. D., 'The House of Blackwood 1804-1954,' 140.
- Trevelyan, Dr G. M., 144, 213 and Note; 'The Selected Poetical Works of George Meredith,' 559.
- Tribe, Sir Frank, 382.
- Truman, President, 171, 172, 306, 374, 426, 428, 430, 432.
- Turkey after Thirty Years of the Revolution,** 346-351.
- Two Minor Victorian Novelists: Lady Georgiana Fullerton & Mrs Norton,** 477-485.
- Tyrrell, Father George, 223, 223, 227, 228.
- V.
- Victor Emmanuel, III, King of Italy, 153, 162.
- Victoria, Queen, 401, 405, 411.
- Vyshinsky, M., 361.
- W.
- Wade, Allen, 'The Letters of W. B. Yeats,' 279-280.
- Waldeck-Rousseau, M., 17.
- Waldemar, Prince, of Denmark, 408.
- Wand, Dr J. W. C., Bishop of London, 'The Life of Jesus Christ,' 417-418.
- Ward, J. D. U., 'A Woodman's Birds,' 486-495.
- Ward, W. G., 464, 465, 466.
- Warren, Chief Justice, 438.
- Wavell, Field-Marshal, 1st Earl, 44, 48.
- Web of Life, The,** 504-511.
- Webb, Sir Harold,** 'The Third Year of Conservative Government,' 1-13.
- Wedgwood, Miss C. V., 'The King's Peace 1637-41,' 412-413.
- Weiner, J. S., 'The Piltdown Forgery,' 271-272.
- Western Technology and the Arab World,** 75-88.
- Weygand, General, 49, 50, 383.
- Wheeler, Sir Mortimer, 'Rome beyond the Imperial Frontiers,' 130.
- Williamson, Hugh Ross, 'Historical Whodunits,' 421-422.
- Willington, 1st Marquess of, 396.
- Wilson, Charles, 'The History of Unilever,' 135-136.
- Wilson, President Woodrow, 298, 426.
- Wingate, Major-General Orde, 47.
- Wolfit, Donald, 'First Interval,' 278.
- Woodman's Birds, A,** 486-495.
- Woodruff, Philip, 289.
- Wright, Gordon, 'The Reshaping of French Democracy,' 165, Note.
- W.S. to Stratford, Conn.,** 547.
- Y.
- Yeats, W. B., 'Autobiographies,' 558. @.
- Ypres, Field-Marshal, 1st Earl of, 50.
- Z.
- Zetland, 2nd Marquess of, 396.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-THIRD VOLUME

the Month

## AN INTERLUDE

ANNE DUNBAR

One of the extraordinary six years which were spent in India with their brother, when he was Governor-General of India, is the author's recently discovered interlude in his life through the observation of highly cultivated women.

18s. net

## THE YAN BARBARY

JOSEPH VON FÜRER-HAEMENDORF

Known to the author and his wife of the obscure region of India and Tibet is the upper Subcontinent. It is a mutual recognizing by the author of the unknown tribes who live there.

21s. net

## THE LITTLE KINGDOM

PETER GOULART

Back on the people of the south-western Yunnan is a remarkable picture of the coming of the Communists.

Illustrations

13s. net

## FROM MOH TO FAROUK

WOOD JARVIS

From 1914 to modern times is a book that interprets history through the people. It is a concise and vivid presentation of a human history.

21s. net

JOHN MURRAY

